arXiv:1701.00239v2 [math.PR] 20 Jan 2017

RANDOMLY WEIGHTED $d-$COMPLEXES: MINIMAL SPANNING ACYCLES AND PERSISTENCE DIAGRAMS

PRIMOZ SKRABA, GUGAN THOPPE, AND D. YOGESHWARAN

Abstract. This paper has three key parts. The first part concerns spanning acycles on simplicial complexes which are higher dimensional analogues of spanning trees. We give a compendium of their basic properties lending further credence to this analogy and acting as a stepping stone for study of minimal spanning acycles on infinite complexes. We also give a simplicial version of the Kruskal's and Jarnìk-Prim-Dijkstra's algorithms for generating minimal spanning acycles. In the second part, using simplicial Kruskal's algorithm, we prove that the set of face-weights of a minimal spanning acycle is same as the set of 'death times' in the associated persistence diagram provided the weights on faces induce a filtration of the complex. Further, we prove a stability result for the face-weights in a minimal spanning acycle, and hence for death and birth times under the L_p matching distance for any $p \in \{0, \ldots, \infty\}$. In the third part, we consider randomly weighted $d-$complexes on n vertices. In the generic case, all faces up to dimension $d-1$ have 0 weights, while the $d-$face weights are perturbation of some i.i.d. distribution. Using the above stability result, we show that if the maximum perturbation converges in probability to 0 sufficiently fast then, the suitably scaled extremal weights in the minimal $d-$spanning acycle and extremal death times in the persistence diagram of the $(d-1)-$th homology converge to the Poisson point process on $\mathbb{R}$ with intensity $e^{-x}\mathrm{d}x$. We lastly show that the $\zeta(3)$ limit of Frieze [29] on total edge-weight of a random minimal spanning tree and asymptotics of lifetime sums of persistence diagrams of randomly weighted complexes by Hiraoka and Shirai [33] also hold for suitable noisy versions.

1. Introduction

This paper investigates extremal properties of persistence diagrams and minimal spanning acycles of a 'mean-field' model of weighted random complexes. As we shall see, intimately related to the above two terms is what we refer to as the "nearest face" distance. In the much more popular scenario of weighted graphs (which are a special case of weighted complexes), persistence diagrams correspond to the vanishing thresholds of number of connected components, minimal spanning acycles correspond to minimal spanning trees and nearest face distance is nothing but the nearest neighbour distance. That connectivity and nearest neighbour distance are intertwined was conspicuous even in the earliest work on connectivity

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary : 60C05, 05E45 Secondary : 60G70, 60B99, 05C80 .

Key words and phrases. Random complexes, Persistent diagrams, Minimal spanning acycles, Point processes, Weak convergence, Stability.

Research supported by EU project Proasense FP7-ICT-2013-10(612329).

Research supported by URSAT, ERC Grant 320422.

Research supported by DST-INSPIRE faculty award.

thresholds for random graphs by Erdős and Rényi [27]. Coincidentally, three years earlier the relation between minimal spanning trees and vanishing of connected components in a graph was used in Kruskal's algorithm to construct a minimal spanning tree [44] and the relation was also used later in the seminal work of Frieze [29]. On the other hand, connections between largest nearest neighbour distances and longest edges of a minimal spanning tree on randomly weighted graphs were at the heart of studies in [32, 61, 3, 54, 35]. More complete accounts of the theory of random graphs and in particular, the relation between the above three quantities can be found in [7, 64, 37, 55, 30].

RANDOM COMPLEXES: In the recent years, motivated by applications in topological data analysis, the study of random graphs has been extended to the study of random complexes. Though we now narrow our focus to a specific random complex, we alert the reader of existence of a richer theory of random complexes and topological data analysis [10, 39, 6, 40, 20]. Before describing random complexes, we define (simplicial) complexes, which are higher dimensional versions of a graph.

Definition 1.1. *An* (abstract) simplical complex $\mathcal{K}$ *on a finite* ground set V *is a collection of subsets of* V *such that if* $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{K}$ *and* $\emptyset \neq \sigma_2 \subset \sigma_1$*, then* $\sigma_2 \in \mathcal{K}$ *as well. The elements of* $\mathcal{K}$ *are called* simplices or faces *and the dimension of a simplex* σ *is* $|\sigma| - 1$*, with* $|\cdot|$ *here denoting the cardinality. A* $d-$*face of* $\mathcal{K}$ *is a face of* $\mathcal{K}$ *with dimension* d*.*

Given a complex $\mathcal{K}$, we denote the d-faces of $\mathcal{K}$ by $\mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K})$ and its d-skeleton by $\mathcal{K}^d$ (i.e., the sub-complex of $\mathcal{K}$ consisting of all faces of dimension at most d) for any $d \geq 0$. We use σ, τ to denote faces and the dimension of the face shall not be explicitly mentioned unless required. If a (simplicial) complex consisted only of 0-faces and 1-faces then it is a graph or in other words, the 1-skeleton of a complex is a graph. Associated to each simplicial complex is a collection of non-negative integers denoted $\beta_0(\mathcal{K}), \beta_1(\mathcal{K}), \ldots$, called the Betti numbers[1] (see Section 2.1 for detailed definitions) which are a measure of connectivity of the simplicial complex. Informally, the $d-$th Betti number counts the number of $(d+1)$-dimensional holes in the complex or equivalently the number of independent non-trivial cycles formed by d-faces. Two points to note at the moment are: (i) $\beta_0(\mathcal{K})$ is one less than the number of connected components in the graph formed by 0-faces and 1-faces and (ii) if the dimension of $\mathcal{K}$ (maximum of dimension of faces) is d, then $\beta_j(\mathcal{K}) = 0$ for all $j \geq d+1$.

The probabilistic model of interest to us is the one introduced by Linial and Meshulam [45] and then extended by Meshulam and Wallach [51]. This model, called as the random d-complex and denoted by $Y_{n,d}(p)$, consists of all faces on n vertices (i.e., ground set $V = [n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$) with dimension at most $(d-1)$ and each d-face is included with probability p independently. $Y_{n,1}(p)$ is the classical Erdős-Rènyi graph on n vertices with edge-connection probability p. Like Erdős-Rènyi graph is a mean-field model of pairwise interactions, the random d-complex can be considered as a model of higher-order interactions. Though a

[1]We work with reduced Betti numbers defined using field coefficients throughout the article.

simple model, it has spanned a rich literature in the recent years [45, 51, 14, 18, 19, 47]. The focus of many studies on random d-complexes have been the two non-trivial Betti numbers of the complex: $\beta_{d-1}(\cdot)$ and $\beta_d(\cdot)$. The starting part of our study is the following fine phase transition result for $\beta_{d-1}(Y_{n,d}(p))$.

Lemma 1.2. [62], [41, Theorem 1.10] *Fix $d \geq 1$. Consider $Y_{n,d}(p_n)$ with*

$$p_n = \frac{d \log n + c - \log(d!)}{n}$$

for some fixed $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, as $n \to \infty$, $\beta_{d-1}(Y_{n,d}(p_n)) \Rightarrow Poi(e^{-c})$, where $Poi(\lambda)$ stands for the Poisson random variable with mean λ and $\Rightarrow$ denotes convergence in distribution.

Additionally, one has that $\beta_{d-1}(Y_{n,d}(p_n)) \to 0$ if $np_n - d \log n \to \infty$ and $\beta_{d-1}(Y_{n,d}(p_n)) \to \infty$ if $np_n - d \log n \to -\infty$. These were proven by Erdős and Rényi [27] in 1959 for $d = 1$, much later by Linial and Meshulam [45] in 2006 for $d = 2$ and shortly thereafter in 2009 for $d \geq 3$ by Meshulam and Wallach [51].

Consider the complex on n vertices having all faces up to dimension d. A standard coupling of random graphs that can be extended to random complexes, is to endow all the d-faces with i.i.d. uniform $[0, 1]$ weights and all other faces having dimension $d - 1$ or less with weight 0. We denote such a weighted random complex as $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}$ and call it the uniformly weighted $d-$complex. Let $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}(t)$ denote the subcomplex of $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}$ with only those faces with weight less than or equal to t. Then, clearly, for $t \in [0, 1]$, $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}(t)$ has the same distribution as $Y_{n,d}(t)$. Topological considerations imply that $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d}(t))$ is a non-increasing, step function in t, i.e., a.s. a non-increasing jump process. Let $\mathcal{D} = \{D_i\}$ (called as *death times* of the $(d-1)$-persistent diagram) denote the set of jump times of this process. Since the weights are a.s. unique, the jump times have no multiplicity. Then clearly the set $\mathcal{D}$ characterises the persistence diagram of $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}$ (see Subsection 2.1.2). Defining the scaled point process $\mathscr{P}^D_{n,d} := \{nD_i - d \log n + \log(d!)\}$, we can rephrase Lemma 1.2 as

$$\mathscr{P}^D_{n,d}(c, \infty) \Rightarrow \mathrm{Poi}(e^{-c}),$$

where, for $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $\mathscr{P}^D_{n,d}(R) := |\{i : nD_i - d \log n + \log(d!) \in R\}|$. See Figure 1(a) for a simulation of death times of the $(d-1)$-persistent diagrams of $\mathcal{U}_{30,d}(t)$ for $d = 1, \ldots, 4$. One of our main results is that the above distributional convergence can be extended to weak convergence of the corresponding point processes in vague topology.

Theorem 1.3. *As $n \to \infty$, $\mathscr{P}^D_{n,d}$ converges in distribution to $\mathscr{P}_{poi}$, where $\mathscr{P}_{poi}$ is the Poisson point process with intensity $e^{-x}\mathrm{d}x$ on $\mathbb{R}$.*

Theorem 1.3 gives convergence of the extremal points of the persistence diagram of a uniformly weighted d-complex. We say extremal points because only the points near the maximum contribute to the scaled point process and the scaling maps many points in the persistence diagram to $-\infty$. A weak convergence result as above along with the continuous mapping theorem yields asymptotic distribution of various statistics of $\mathscr{P}^D_{n,d}$. For example, one can infer the asymptotic joint distribution of the largest m points in the persistence

diagram whereas Lemma 1.2 will give only result about the one-dimensional marginal distributions. Further, our results might be useful in deriving asymptotics for other summary statistics of persistence diagrams such as persistence landscapes [8], homological scaffolds [56] or accumulative persistence function [5]. An important paradigm in topological data analysis is that extremal points of a persistence diagram encode meaningful topological information about the underlying structure. Viewed in this light, our result completely characterizes the extremal behaviour of the persistence diagram of the uniformly weighted d-complex.

We would like to emphasize that to the best of our knowledge this is the first such complete characterization of extremal persistence diagram of a model of random complex in higher dimensions and to nobody's surprise, it is for the simplest model of a random complex. For the case $d = 1$, which corresponds to β_0, Theorem 1.3 for a model of random geometric graphs can be deduced from the results of [54, 35]. As with many other scaling limit results, one would expect our result to hold for many other random complex models such as random clique complexes [39], random geometric complexes [6], etc. But this is beyond the scope of the current paper. As for our proof, it mainly involves an application of the factorial moment method to show convergence of the point process of largest nearest face distances and using this to approximate the extremal persistence diagram of the uniformly weighted d-complex. Though such an approach should not surprise someone familiar with the proof technionques of [45, 51, 41], the theorem significantly extends the connection between nearest neighbour distances and connectivity of random graphs to random complexes. We discuss important extensions of these results a little later. Having discussed so far persistence diagrams and nearest face distances, we now discuss the more novel component of the paper.

Minimal Spanning Acycle: A spanning tree of a graph on a vertex set V is easily described in topological terms as a set of edges S such that $\beta_0(V \cup S) = \beta_1(V \cup S) = 0$, i.e., $V \cup S$ is connected and has no cycles. As an higher-dimensional generalization, the following definition due to Kalai [42] is natural.

Definition 1.4 (Spanning acycle)**.** *Consider a complex $\mathcal{K}$ of dimension at least d, $d \geq 1$. A subset S of d-faces is called a* spanning acycle *if $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) = 0$ (spanning) and $\beta_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) = 0$ (acyclicity). A subset S of d-faces is called a* maximal acycle *if it is an acycle and maximal w.r.t. inclusion of d-faces.*

Though the definition of a spanning acycle appears natural and seems to be merely replacing the appropriate indices in the definition of a spanning tree, what is not obvious is that this is a good higher-dimensional generalization of a spanning tree and enjoys the many nice properties spanning trees do. An algebraic description of a spanning tree is that it is the set of columns that form a basis for the column space of the incidence matrix or boundary matrix, i.e., the matrix ∂_1 whose rows are indexed by vertices and columns by edges such that the $i, j-$th entry is 1 if the vertex i belongs to the edge j and 0 otherwise[2]. Such a

[2]For simplicity, we are assuming our underlying field $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}_2$ here, i.e., all vector spaces involved are $\mathbb{Z}_2$-vector spaces.



FIGURE 1. (Left) The death times corresponding to the uniformly weighted random d-complex built on 30 points in different dimensions. (Right) The persistence diagram for an Erdős-Renyi clique complex for 50 points.

description (described in an earlier version of the article - [59, Appendix B]) also holds for spanning acycles and underpins many of our proof ideas even though it is not mentioned explicitly. Further, once we assign weights to faces, that is we consider a weighted complex $\mathcal{K}$, one can naturally define a minimal spanning acycle. Since we deal with only finite complexes, existence of a minimal spanning acycle is guaranteed once a spanning acycle exists. Though Kalai's definition of a spanning acycle and enumeration of number of spanning cycles (a generalization of Cayley's formula for spanning trees) is more than three decades old, it is receiving increased attention in the last few years [4, 24, 36, 43, 33, 34, 48, 46, 50].

Our second significant contribution is to add to this burgeoning literature on spanning acycles and the nascent literature on random spanning acycles. Firstly, we list a number of basic properties of (minimal) spanning acycles analogous to those known for (minimal) spanning trees. We expect this enumeration of properties (see Section 3.1) - existence, uniqueness, cut property, cycle property, exchange property - to be useful in further research on (minimal) spanning acycles. We also present the simplicial Kruskal's and Jarník-Prim-Dijkstra's algorithm (see Section 3.2) to generate minimal spanning acycles. We believe that many of the properties we have enumerated - especially the Prim's algorithm and Lemma 3.25 - are important steps towards study of minimal spanning acycles on infinite complexes and in particular Euclidean minimal spanning acycles. For analogous results about minimal spanning trees, see [49, Chapter 11], and for the Euclidean case, refer to [1, 2].

Though many of the above properties can be proved independently using matroid theory [65, 53]) and such a viewpoint has been beneficial to the study of spanning acycles (see [4, 34] and in particular [43, Section 4]), we provide self-contained proofs here using tools

from combinatorial topology. It is possible that some of these results have been implicitly used in the literature but we have not been able to find explicit mention of these properties elsewhere. We now highlight an inclusion-exclusion identity which relies heavily on Mayer-Vietoris exact sequence from algebraic topology. If $\gamma_d(\mathcal{K})$ were to denote the cardinality of a spanning acycle and $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2$ are two finite complexes, then

$$\gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1) + \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_2) = \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2) + \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2) + \beta(\ker \nu_{d-1}),$$

where the homomorphism ν_{d-1} is precisely defined in Theorem 3.7, ker stands for kernel and $\beta(\cdot)$ denotes the rank. The matroidal property of spanning acycles shall only yield an inequality. Higher-dimensional connectivity can be studied via hypergraphs as well and we briefly discuss this relation with hypergraph connectivity in Section 3.2, in particular showing that if the $(d-1)$-faces of the complex $\mathcal{K}$ are hypergraph connected, so is the spanning acycle. We also wish to point out that properties of spanning acycles are preserved under simplicial isomorphisms but not necessarily under homotopy equivalence.

Persistent Diagrams and Minimal Spanning Acycles. Having introduced minimal spanning acycles and discussed their basic properties, we now preview their connection to persistence diagrams. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a weighted complex with real valued injective [3]weight function w such that $\mathcal{K}(t) := w^{-1}(\infty, t]$ is a simplicial complex for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $d \geq 0$ be arbitrary and suppose that $\beta_d(\mathcal{K}) = 0$. Let $\beta_d(t) = \beta_d(\mathcal{K}(t))$. We remark that $\beta_d(t)$ is a jump function. The times of positive jumps are birth times $\mathcal{B} = \{B_i\}$ of the persistence diagram and the times of negative jumps are death times $\mathcal{D} = \{D_i\}$ of the persistence diagram as described earlier. Persistent diagram (or homology) is more than merely keeping track of death and birth times and in particular considers the (complex) pairings of birth times with their "corresponding" death times (For example, see Figure 1(b) for a persistence diagram of Erdős-Rènyi clique complexes). In this article we shall focus only on their two projections - birth and death times.

An easy consequence of the above informal description that can be justified via Fubini's theorem is the following identity for *lifetime sum* of persistence diagrams :

$$L_d := \sum_i (D_i - B_i) = \int_0^\infty \beta_d(t) \mathrm{d}t. \tag{1.1}$$

Assume that $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = \beta_{d-2}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$. This assures us that M_d and M_{d-1}, respectively the $d-$th and $(d-1)-$th minimal spanning acycle, exist and are unique (see Lemmas 3.6 and 2.6). Under the above conditions, we have one of our important results (Theorem 3.23) :

$$\mathcal{D}_d = \{w(\sigma) : \sigma \in M_d\},\ \mathcal{B}_{d-1} = \{w(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1} \setminus M_{d-1}\}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{d-1}, \mathcal{D}_d$ are respectively the birth and death times of the $\mathrm{H}_{d-1}(\cdot)$ persistence diagram of $\mathcal{K}$. The simplicial version of Kruskal's algorithm and the incremental algorithm for persistence (which is also a greedy algorithm) are the crucial tools in the above proof. As a

[3]Our results hold for non-injective monotonic weight functions as well but birth and death times need to be defined appropriately.

corollary of the above, we derive the following relation

$$(1.3)\quad L_{d-1} = \int_0^\infty \beta_{d-1}(t)\mathrm{d}t = \sum_{\sigma\in M_d} w(\sigma) - \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{F}^{d-1}\setminus M_{d-1}} w(\sigma) = w(M_d)+w(M_{d-1})-w(\mathcal{F}^{d-1}),$$

where $w(S) = \sum_{\sigma\in S} w(\sigma)$ for a subset S of simplices. For $d = 1$ (assuming $\mathcal{K}^0 \subset w^{-1}(0)$), the above relation can be derived from Kruskal's algorithm and, for $d \geq 2$, this relation was derived recently in [33, Theorem 1.1] using different techniques. This latter paper and, in particular, their derivation of (1.3) served as our stimulus to investigate minimal spanning acycles. Apart from the striking simplicity of the result connecting minimal spanning acycles to persistence diagram, we believe the relation can be useful in studying either of them using the other. Since much of the complication in understanding persistent homology arises from the complex pairing of birth and death times, the above result is useful in understanding death or birth times individually and in certain cases, this shall yield useful information (e.g. lifetime sum) even without knowledge of the pairings.

As a trivial corollary to Theorem 1.3, we can deduce point process convergence of extremal weights of a minimal spanning acycle on uniformly weighted d-complexes. To the best of our knowledge, such a result (though not surprising) is not known even for complete graphs with i.i.d. uniform $[0, 1]$-weights, which might be considered as a mean-field model for random metric spaces. Again for random geometric graphs, such a point process convergence result for extremal edge weights of the minimal spanning tree has been proven in [54, 35]. These results were important in understanding connectivity of random geometric graphs. However, here the scenario has been reversed. We have gone from results on connectivity (i.e., $\mathrm{H}_k(\cdot)$ persistence diagrams) to those for minimal spanning acycles.

Stability Results. Stability results (e.g. [25, Section VIII.2], [11, 12, 15, 16]) are an important cog in the wheel of topological data analysis and provide a theoretical justification for the robustness of persistent homology. While L_∞ stability (or *bottleneck stability*) is the most standard form of stability proven for persistence diagrams, L_p stability for $p \geq 0$ requires restrictive assumptions and are not widely applicable. Using simplicial version of Kruskal's algorithm and the correspondence (1.2), we prove the following stability result separately for birth and death times with minimal assumptions.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a finite complex with two weight functions f, g; both of which induce a filtration on $\mathcal{K}$. Let*

$$\mathcal{B}_f = \{B_i\}\ ;\ \mathcal{D}_f = \{D_i\}\ ;\ \mathcal{B}_g = \{B'_i\}\ ;\ \mathcal{D}_g = \{D'_i\}$$

be the respective birth and death times in the $\mathrm{H}_d(\cdot)$ and $\mathrm{H}_{d-1}(\cdot)$ persistence diagrams of f, g respectively. Let Π_D be the set of bijections from $\mathcal{D}_f$ to $\mathcal{D}_g$ and similarly, Π_B, the set of bijections from $\mathcal{B}_f$ to $\mathcal{B}_g$. Then for any $p \in \{0, \ldots, \infty\}$,

$$\max\{\inf_{\pi\in\Pi_D}\sum_i |D_i - \pi(D'_i)|^p, \inf_{\pi\in\Pi_B}\sum_i |B_i - \pi(B'_i)|^p\} \leq \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{F}^d} |f(\sigma) - g(\sigma)|^p,$$

For $p = \infty$ and a sequence $\{x_i\}_{i\geq 1}$, in the usual manner $\sum_i |x_i|^p$ should be read as $\sup_i |x_i|$.

As part of the proof of the above stability result, we show that changing weights of m ($m \geq 1$) faces can change at most m death times and m birth times by the difference between the weights on the faces. One might suspect that the L_∞ stability in the above theorem can be deduced from bottleneck stability of persistence diagrams by a projection argument. We would like to point out that this is not the case. This is mainly due to the fact that the diagonal plays a special role in the definition of bottleneck stability of persistence diagrams whereas there is no such equivalent for bottleneck distance between point processes on $\mathbb{R}$. We explore consequences of the above stability result in the context of weighted random complexes. In particular, we consider the generically weighted d-complex $\mathcal{L}'_{n,d}$ whose d-faces σ have weights $\phi(\sigma) = w(\sigma) + \epsilon_n(\sigma)$ where $w(\sigma)$ are i.i.d. with a strictly increasing and Lipschitz continuous distribution and $\epsilon_n(\sigma)$'s are a arbitrary collection of random variables. Regardless of any dependence properties of $\epsilon_n(\sigma)$'s, we show that if $n \sup_\sigma |\epsilon_n(\sigma)| \to 0$ in probability, then the point process of extremal face-weights of the minimal spanning acycle (resp. death times) converge again to the Poisson point process with intensity $e^{-x}\mathrm{d}x$ on $\mathbb{R}$. In other words, Theorem 1.3 holds for both death times and face-weights of the minimal spanning acycles under the perturbed set-up provided the perturbations decay sufficiently fast. We also mention special cases where the above condition can be verified easily.

Reconsider the uniformly weighted $d-$complex $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}$. In this case, we have that the *lifetime sum* $L_{n,1}$ (see (1.1)) is equal to the weight of the minimal spanning tree (see (1.3)). A celebrated result in the theory of minimal spanning trees by Frieze ([29]) shows that

$$L_{n,1} \overset{a.s.}{\to} \zeta(3) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-3} = 1.202, \tag{1.4}$$

where $\zeta(\cdot)$ is Riemann's zeta function. In higher dimensions, Hiraoka-Shirai [33, Theorem 1.2] showed recently that $\mathbb{E}[L_{n,d}] = \Theta(n^{d-1})$. The existence of a limit and its value still remains open for $d \geq 2$. As a consequence of our stability result (Theorem 1.5), we trivially get that the above results of Frieze and Hiroaka-Shirai hold in expectation for the noisy random complex $\mathcal{L}'_{n,d}$ provided $\sup_\sigma \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_n(\sigma)] = o(n^{-2})$. While it is believed that introducing weak dependencies between the random variables will not affect the asymptotics, it is not often easy to rigorously prove such a statement. In general, our results shall help one to easily establish limit theorems for a "noisy" version of any random complex model once it has been established for the random complex model without noise. For example, in [33, Theorem 6.10], an upper and lower bound for the expected lifetime was shown. It is possible to extend these bounds to a suitable noisy version of the random clique complexes.

Organisation of Paper: The next section - Section 2 - gives in detail the necessary topological (Section 2.1) and probabilistic preliminaries (Section 2.2)[4]. Section 3 is exclusively devoted to studying various properties of minimal spanning acycles (Section 3.1), algorithms to generate them (Section 3.2), their connection to persistence diagrams (Section 3.3) and

[4]In our effort to make this article reasonably self-contained as well as accessible to the trio of probabilists, combinatorialists and topologists, we might have erred on the side of details rather than terseness.

a crucial stability result (Section 3.4). In the next two sections, we study weighted simplicial complexes wherein the weights have been generated randomly and prove our point process convergence results. In Section 4, the weights are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) uniform $[0,1]$ random variables and in Section 5, the weights are either i.i.d. with a more general distribution $\mathscr{F}$ or a perturbation of the same. The appendix (Section 5.1)collects results regarding point process convergence in vague topology.

2. Preliminaries

We describe here the basic notions of simplicial homology and persistent homology. In an earlier version of the article (see [59, Appendix B]), we have rephrased our topological notions in the language of matrices for ease of understanding. After topological preliminaries are covered here, we review notions regarding point processes and their weak convergence.

2.1. **Topological Notions.** We restrict ourselves to studying *simplicial complexes* and shall always choose our coefficients from a field $\mathbb{F}$. In this regard, 0 stands for additive identity, 1 stands for multiplicative identity and -1 for the additive inverse of 1. An often convenient choice in computational topology is $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}_2$ in which case $1 = -1$.

2.1.1. *Simplicial Homology.* This provides an algebraic tool to study the topology of a simplicial complex. For a good introduction to algebraic topology, see [31], and for simplicial complexes and homology, see [25, 52].

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a simplicial complex (see Definition 1.1). We assume throughout that all our simplicial complexes are defined over a finite set V. Further, we denote the cardinality of $\mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K})$ by $f_d(\mathcal{K})$. The 0-faces of $\mathcal{K}$ are also called as *vertices*. When obvious, we shall omit the reference to the underlying complex $\mathcal{K}$ in the notation. A d-simplex σ is often represented as $[v_0, \ldots, v_d]$ to explicitly indicate the subset of V generating the simplex σ.

An *orientation* of a d-simplex is given by an ordering of the vertices and denoted by $[v_0, \ldots, v_d]$. Two orderings induce the same orientation if and only if they differ by an even permutation of the vertices. In other words, for a permutation π on $[d]$,

$$[v_0, \ldots, v_d] = (-1)^{sgn(\pi)}[v_{\pi(0)}, \ldots, v_{\pi(d)}].$$

We assume that each simplex in our complex is assigned a specific orientation (i.e., ordering).

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field. A simplicial d-chain is a formal sum of oriented d-simplices $\sum_i c_i\sigma_i, c_i \in \mathbb{F}$. The free abelian group generated by the d-chains is denoted by the $C_d(\mathcal{K})$, the $d-$th chain group, i.e.,

$$C_d(\mathcal{K}) := \left\{ \sum_i c_i\sigma_i : c_i \in \mathbb{F}, \sigma_i \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K}) \right\}.$$

Clearly $C_d(\mathcal{K})$ is a $\mathbb{F}$-vector space. We shall set $C_{-1} = \mathbb{F}$ and $C_d = 0$ for $d = -2, -3, \ldots$. For a vector space, we shall denote the rank by $\beta(\cdot)$. Thus, $\beta(C_d) = f_d$ for $d \geq 0$. For $d \geq 1$, we define the boundary operator $\partial_d : C_d \longrightarrow C_{d-1}$ first on each $d-$simplex as below and then

extend it linearly on C_d:

$$\partial_d([v_0,\ldots,v_d]) = \sum_{i=0}^{d}(-1)^i[v_0,\ldots,\hat{v_i},\ldots,v_d],$$

where $\hat{v_i}$ denotes that v_i is to be omitted. ∂_0 is defined by setting $\partial_0([v]) = 1$ for all $v \in \mathcal{F}^0$. It can be verified that ∂_d is a linear map of vector spaces and more importantly that $\partial_{d-1}\circ\partial_d = 0$ for all $d \geq 1$, i.e., boundary of a boundary is zero. When the context is clear, we will drop the dimension d from the subscript of ∂_d.

Note that the free abelian group of d-chains is defined only using $\mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K})$. When we use a subset $S \subset \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K})$ of d-faces rather than the entire collection of d-faces to generate the free abelian group, we shall call the corresponding free abelian (sub)group of d-chains as $C_d(S)$. In other words, $C_d(S) = C_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S)$. Also, for a d-chain $\sum_i a_i\sigma_i$, the support denoted as $supp(\sum_i a_i\sigma_i)$ is $\{\sigma_i : a_i \neq 0\} \subset \mathcal{F}^d$. For $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}_2$, the support characterizes the d-chain.

The $d-$th *boundary space* denoted by B_d is im ∂_{d+1} and the $d-$th *cycle space* Z_d is $\ker\partial_d$. Elements of Z_d are called *cycles* or *d-cycles* to be more specific. The d-dimensional (reduced)[5] homology group is then defined as the quotient group

$$\mathrm{H}_d = \frac{Z_d}{B_d}. \tag{2.1}$$

Again, since we are working with field coefficients, B_d, Z_d and H_d are all $\mathbb{F}-$vector spaces. The $d-$th *Betti number* of the complex $\beta_d(\mathcal{K})$ is defined to be the rank of the vector space H_d. Respectively, let $b_d(\mathcal{K}) := \beta(B_d)$ and $z_d(\mathcal{K}) := \beta(Z_d)$ denote the ranks of the $d-$th boundary and $d-$th cycle spaces respectively. Thus we have that $\beta_d = z_d - b_d$. Note that we drop the adjective reduced henceforth, but all our homology groups and Betti numbers are indeed reduced ones. Some authors prefer to use $\tilde{H}_d$ and $\tilde{\beta}_d$ to denote reduced homology groups and Betti numbers respectively, but we refrain from doing so for notational convenience. However, under such a notation, we note that $\beta_d - \tilde{\beta}_d = 1[d = 0]$. This gives an easy way to translate results for reduced Betti numbers to Betti numbers and vice-versa. We denote the Euler-Poincaré characteristic by χ and the Euler-Poincaré formula holds as follows:

$$\chi(\mathcal{K}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(-1)^j f_j(\mathcal{K}) = 1 + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(-1)^j\beta_j(\mathcal{K}). \tag{2.2}$$

An important property of homology groups that is often of use is the following: If $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2$ are two complexes such that the function $h : \mathcal{K}_1^0 \to \mathcal{K}_2^0$ is a *simplicial map* (i.e., $\sigma_1 = [v_0,\ldots,v_d] \in \mathcal{K}_1$ implies that $h(\sigma_1) = [h(v_0),\ldots,h(v_d)] \in \mathcal{K}_2$ for all $d \geq 0$), then there exists an homomorphism $h_* : \mathrm{H}_d(\mathcal{K}_1) \to \mathrm{H}_d(\mathcal{K}_2)$ called the *induced homomorphism* between the homology groups. One of the natural simplicial maps is the inclusion map from a complex $\mathcal{K}_1$ to $\mathcal{K}_2$ such that $\mathcal{K}_1 \subset \mathcal{K}_2$. One of the tools in algebraic topology we use is the *Mayer-Vietoris sequence*. Below we state it explicitly and its implication for Betti numbers.

A sequence of vector spaces $V_1,\ldots,V_l$ and linear maps $\nu_i : V_i \to V_{i+1}$, $i = 1,\ldots,l-1$ is said to be *exact* if im $\nu_i = \ker\nu_{i+1}$ for all $i = 1,\ldots,l-1$.

[5]Reduced is used to refer to the convention that $C_{-1} = \mathbb{F}$ instead of $C_{-1} = 0$.

Lemma 2.1. *(Mayer-Vietoris Sequence* [52, Theorem 25.1] , [22, Corollary 2.2].*)*
Let $\mathcal{K}_1$ and $\mathcal{K}_2$ be two finite simplicial complexes and $\mathcal{K}_0 = \mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2$ (i.e., $\mathcal{K}_0$ is the complex formed from all the simplices that are in both $\mathcal{K}_1$ and $\mathcal{K}_2$). Then the following are true:

(1) *The following is an exact sequence, and, furthermore, the homomorphisms ν_d are induced by the respective inclusions:*

$$\cdots \to \mathrm{H}_d(\mathcal{K}_0) \stackrel{\nu_d}{\to} \mathrm{H}_d(\mathcal{K}_1) \oplus \mathrm{H}_d(\mathcal{K}_2) \to \mathrm{H}_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2) \\ \to \mathrm{H}_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}_0) \stackrel{\nu_{d-1}}{\to} \mathrm{H}_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}_1) \oplus \mathrm{H}_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}_2) \to \cdots$$

(2) *Furthermore,*

$$\beta_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2) \;=\; \beta_d(\mathcal{K}_1) + \beta_d(\mathcal{K}_2) + \beta(\ker \nu_d) + \beta(\ker \nu_{d-1}) - \beta_d(\mathcal{K}_0). \tag{2.3}$$

2.1.2. *Persistent Homology.* A *filtration* of a simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}$ is a sequence of subcomplexes $\{\mathcal{K}(t) : t \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}\}$ satisfying

$$\emptyset = \mathcal{K}(-\infty) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(t_1) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(t_2) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\infty) = \mathcal{K}$$

for all $-\infty < t_1 \leq t_2 < \infty$. Put differently, the filtration $\{\mathcal{K}(t) : t \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}\}$ describes how to build $\mathcal{K}$ by adding collections of simplices at a time. Persistent homology provides a formal tool to understand how the topology of a filtration evolves as the filtration parameter changes. For more complete introduction and survey of persistent homology, see [25, 9, 10].

We now describe the natural filtration associated with *weighted simplicial complexes*. Consider a simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}$ weighted by $w : \mathcal{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $w(\sigma) \leq w(\tau)$, whenever $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\sigma \subset \tau$. Functions having this property are called *monotonic functions* in [25, Chapter VIII]. As w is monotone, $\{\mathcal{K}(t) : t \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}\}$ with $\mathcal{K}(t) := w^{-1}(-\infty, t]$ forms a *sublevel set* filtration of $\mathcal{K}$. Further note that w induces a partial order on the faces of $\mathcal{K}$. Assuming axiom of choice, this partial order can always be extended to a total order [63]. Let $<_l$ denote one such total order. We make the standing assumption that for a given weight function w, the same total order $<_l$ is chosen and used throughout the article.

One can now view the above sublevel set filtration associated with $(\mathcal{K}, w)$ in a dynamic fashion: as the parameter t evolves over $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$, $\mathcal{K}$ gets built one face at a time respecting the total order $<_l$. In this way, with the addition of faces, the topology of $\mathcal{K}$ evolves. Clearly

$$\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-) := \{\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{K} : w(\sigma_1) <_l w(\sigma)\} \tag{2.4}$$

denotes the complex right before the face σ is to be added. Thus given a monotonic weight function w, we can construct a filtration with respect to the chosen total order $<_l$. We shall call this filtration the *canonical filtration* associated with the total order $<_l$ or a *linear filtration* of the weight function w.

To track the changes in topology, akin to the definition for homology given in (2.1), we define the (t_1, t_2)-*persistent homology group* as the quotient group

$$\mathrm{H}_d^{t_1,t_2} = \frac{Z_d^{t_1}}{Z_d^{t_1} \cap B_d^{t_2}}, \qquad t_1 \leq t_2.$$

The information for all pairs (t_1, t_2) can be encoded in a unique interval representation called a *persistence barcode* [67] or equivalently a *persistence diagram* [15]. Before giving the definition, we first note that for a finite simplicial complex endowed with a total ordering $<_l$, we can reindex the filtration by assigning a natural number to each simplex. We refer to this as a *discrete filtration* $w_{\mathbb{N}}$ corresponding to the monotonic weight function w i.e., $w_{\mathbb{N}}(\sigma) < w_{\mathbb{N}}(\tau)$ iff $w(\sigma) <_l w(\tau)$. Note that there is a bijection between total orders $<_l$ and weight function $w_{\mathbb{N}}$. Thus, the discrete filtration has a natural, well-defined projection π back to the original function values,

$$\pi(i) \mapsto w(\sigma) | w_{\mathbb{N}}(\sigma) = i$$

Definition 2.2. *Given a simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}$ with a monotonic function w and the corresponding discrete filtration $w_{\mathbb{N}} : \mathcal{K} \to \mathbb{N}$, the $d-$th persistence diagram* $\mathrm{Dgm}(\mathcal{K}, w_{\mathbb{N}})$ *is the multiset of points in the extended grid $\overline{\mathbb{N}}^2$ such that the each point (i, j) in the diagram represents a distinct class (i.e., a topological feature) in $\mathrm{H}_d(w_{\mathbb{N}}^{-1}(-\infty, t])$ for all $t \in [i, j)$ and is not a topological feature in $t \notin [i, j)$. The persistence diagram* $\mathrm{Dgm}(\mathcal{K}, w)$ *is then defined as the projection of the multiset of points under π, i.e., $(i, j) \in \mathrm{Dgm}(\mathcal{K}, w_{\mathbb{N}})$ iff $(\pi(i), \pi(j)) \in \mathrm{Dgm}(\mathcal{K}, w)$.*

This differs from the typical definition of a persistence diagram, where the existence and uniqueness of the persistence diagram is defined in terms of an algebraic decomposition into interval modules see [13, 21]. For technical reasons, this approach generally discards the points on the diagonal, i.e., topological features which are both born and die at time t. In the above definition, the total order guarantees that there are no points on the diagonal of the discrete filtration. However, since we deal with the restricted setting of piece-wise constant functions on finite simplicial complexes, we do not lose any information, indeed we keep more of the chain level information. We then transform the persistence diagram back to the original monotone function. After the transformation, points may lie on the diagonal and as we see, we will require these points.

Our definition is used implicitly in [67], which first identified the algebraic decomposition as a consequence of the structure theorem of finitely generated modules over a principle ideal domain. This applies in this setting since the homology groups of finite simplicial complexes are always finitely generated. Therefore, we could have equivalently defined the diagram using the decomposition directly as done in Corollary 3.1 in [67], as the modified Smith Normal Form of the boundary operator [60]. We believe that our definition is more accessible to a non-algebraic audience and is included for completeness. But more important for us are birth and death times defined below.

Definition 2.3. *The* death times *(respectively* birth times*) of the filtration associated with $(\mathcal{K}, w)$ are equal to the multiset of y-coordinates (x-coordinates) of points in* $\mathrm{Dgm}(\mathcal{K}, w)$.

We shall now discuss the notion of negative and positive faces which are vital tools for our proofs. We begin with an application of the Mayer-Vietoris exact sequences for complexes.

Lemma 2.4. *([22, Section 3]) Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a simplicial complex on vertex set V and $\sigma \subset V$ be a set of cardinality $d+1$ in V for some $d \geq 0$. Further, assume that $\sigma \notin \mathcal{K}$ but $\partial\sigma \in C_{d-1}(\mathcal{K})$. Then $\beta_j(\mathcal{K} \cup \sigma) = \beta_j(\mathcal{K})$ for all $j \notin \{d-1, d\}$. Further, one and only one of the following two statements hold:*

(1) $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K} \cup \sigma) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) - 1$.
(2) $\beta_d(\mathcal{K} \cup \sigma) = \beta_d(\mathcal{K}) + 1$.

From the definition of the cycle and boundary spaces, the above two numbered statements can be interpreted equivalently in the following manner which shall be useful for us:

$$\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K} \cup \sigma) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) - 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad b_{d-1}(\mathcal{K} \cup \sigma) = b_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) + 1 \Leftrightarrow \partial\sigma \notin \partial(C_d(\mathcal{K})), \tag{2.5}$$

$$\beta_d(\mathcal{K} \cup \sigma) = \beta_d(\mathcal{K}) + 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad z_d(\mathcal{K} \cup \sigma) = z_d(\mathcal{K}) + 1 \Leftrightarrow \partial\sigma \in \partial(C_d(\mathcal{K})). \tag{2.6}$$

Definition 2.5 (Positive and Negative faces)**.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a complex with vertex set V and $\sigma \subset V$ be a set of cardinality $d+1$ for some $d \geq 0$. Further assume that $\sigma \notin \mathcal{K}$ but $\partial\sigma \in C_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) \neq 0$. Such a σ is called a* negative face *w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}$ if $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K} \cup \sigma) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) - 1$. σ is called a* positive face *if it is not negative, i.e., $\beta_d(\mathcal{K} \cup \sigma) = \beta_d(\mathcal{K}) + 1$.*

This is useful for understanding how the topology evolves in the linear filtration of w (recall (2.4)). If σ is a $d-$face, then Lemma 2.4 shows that the relationship between the topology of the setup before and after addition of σ is as follows: (i) $\beta_j(\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-) \cup \sigma) = \beta_j(\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-))$ for all $j \notin \{d, d-1\}$, (ii) one and exactly one of the following is true:

$$\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-) \cup \sigma) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)) - 1 \tag{2.7}$$

or

$$\beta_d(\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-) \cup \sigma) = \beta_d(\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)) + 1. \tag{2.8}$$

As in Definition 2.5, when (2.7) holds (respectively (2.8) holds) σ will be called a negative face (positive face) w.r.t. the natural filtration of $(\mathcal{K}, w)$. We emphasize that the total order $<_l$ uniquely determines the label of faces as either positive or negative. The above discussion can be neatly converted to an algorithm to generate birth and death times of the persistence diagram with respect to a given linear filtration of the weight function w.

Algorithm 1 Incremental Persistence Algorithm

Input: $\mathcal{K}, w$
Main Procedure:
$F = \mathcal{F}^d$
while $F \neq \emptyset$

- remove a face σ with minimum weight (w.r.t $<_l$) from F. Set $d = dim(\sigma)$.
- if σ is negative w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)$, i.e., if $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-) \cup \sigma) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)) - 1$ then add $w(\sigma)$ to $\mathcal{D}_{d-1}$ else add $w(\sigma)$ to $\mathcal{B}_d$.

Output $\mathcal{B}_d, \mathcal{D}_d$, for all $d \geq 0$.

The above algorithm is a simplification of the persistence algorithm in [26, Fig. 5] which also used negative and positive simplices. The simplification in our algorithm essentially lies in turning a blind eye to the information about the pairing between the birth and death times. The equivalence of negative faces with death times (and hence positive faces with birth times) was established in [67, Fig. 9]. These algorithms extended the incremental algorithm for computing Betti numbers in [22]. We summarize the algorithm, especially for ease for future reference, as follows : Let σ be a d-face in $\mathcal{K}$.

(2.9) $\quad w(\sigma) \in \mathcal{D}_{d-1} \Leftrightarrow$ (2.7) holds or equivalently $w(\sigma) \in \mathcal{B}_d \Leftrightarrow$ (2.8) holds

We end this subsection reiterating a remark with respect to our proofs.

Remark 2.6. *As already explained, if $\mathcal{K}$ is a weighted simplicial complex, there is a unique total ordering of the faces if the weight function is injective otherwise, it is only a partial ordering. However, this partial ordering can be extended to a total order. This correspondence between monotonic weights and total orders shall be used to simplify many of our proofs. We shall often prove many statements for weighted simplicial complexes with unique weights and appeal to this correspondence in extending the proof to general monotonic weight functions. Equivalently, one can prove results for $w_{\mathbb{N}}$ and then use the natural projection π to obtain the corresponding result for monotonic weight function w.*

2.1.3. *Spanning acycles.* As made clear in the title, the other key object of our study is the *spanning acycle*, which has been already introduced in Definition 1.4. We now discuss the definition in more detail. Apart from being more restrictive than that in [33, 42], our definition differs from that of [33] in its use of field coefficients over integer coefficients. Clearly, in the case of $d = 1$, S is a *minimal spanning tree* on the graph $\mathcal{K}^1$. Strictly speaking, the above definition is that of a d-spanning acycle but since in most cases the dimension d will be clear from the context, we shall not explicitly refer to the dimension d. Also, we shall say that a subset S is spanning or an acycle to refer to the respective equalities in the definition 1.4. We postpone further discussion of spanning acycles to Section 3 where we answer many natural questions arising about spanning acycles.

Recall that for any $S \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, $w(S) = \sum_{\sigma \in S} w(\sigma)$ as the weight of S. Suppose the simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}$ was a weighted complex with weight function w, we can define the weight of any spanning acycle $S \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ as $w(S)$. A *minimal spanning acycle* of $\mathcal{K}$ is a spanning acycle $S \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ with the minimum weight. In other words, if we denote the set of d-spanning acycles of $\mathcal{K}$ by $\mathcal{S}^d(\mathcal{K})$, then $S_0 \in \mathcal{S}^d(\mathcal{K})$ is a minimal spanning acycle if

$$w(S_0) = \min_{S \in \mathcal{S}^d(\mathcal{K})} w(S). \tag{2.10}$$

Spanning trees and more generally connectivity in the case of graphs can be extended in a multitude of ways to higher-dimensions. Betti numbers and acycles represent one possible (and indeed a very satisfying) generalization to higher dimensions. Another common generalization is the notion of a *hypergraph*. In this context, one can define a hypergraph on a simplicial complex by considering all the faces as hyper-edges. We shall discuss briefly hypergraph-connectivity of spanning acycles (see Section 3.2).

2.2. **Probabilistic notions.** We give here a brief introduction to point processes on $\mathbb{R}$ with a special focus on Poisson point processes. We discuss further about point processes and state some results required for a self-contained treatment in Section A. For a more detailed reading on weak convergence of point processes, we refer the reader to [58, Chapter 3]. Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ be the Borel $\sigma-$algebra of subsets in $\mathbb{R}$.

A *point measure* on $\mathbb{R}$ is a map from $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ to the set of natural numbers, i.e., it is a Radon (locally-finite) counting measure. A point measure m is represented as $m(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{x_i}(\cdot)$, for some countable but locally-finite collection of points $\{x_i\}$ in $\mathbb{R}$ and where $\delta_x(\cdot)$ denotes the delta measure at x. Alternatively, we define the support of the point measure m, denoted by $supp(m)$ as the multi-set $\{x_i\}$. A point measure is *simple* if $m(\{x\}) \leq 1$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $M_p(\mathbb{R})$ denote the set of all point measures on $\mathbb{R}$. Also let $C_c^+(\mathbb{R})$ denote the set of all continuous, non-negative functions $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ with compact support. For $f \in C_c^+(\mathbb{R})$ and $m = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{x_i} \in M_p(\mathbb{R})$, define

$$m(f) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f dm = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} f(x_i). \tag{2.11}$$

Let $m_n, m \in M_p(\mathbb{R})$. We will say that m_n converges *vaguely* to m, denoted $m_n \xrightarrow{v} m$, if for every $f \in C_c^+(\mathbb{R})$, $m_n(f) \to m(f)$. Using this notion of vague convergence, one defines the vague topology on $M_p(\mathbb{R})$. That is, a subset of $M_p(\mathbb{R})$ is vaguely closed if it includes all its limit points w.r.t. vague convergence. The sub-base for this topology consists of open sets of the form

$$\{m \in M_p(\mathbb{R}) : m(f) \in (s,t)\},\ f \in C_c^+(\mathbb{R}),\ s,t \in \mathbb{R},\ s < t.$$

A *point process* $\mathscr{P}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ is a random variable taking values in the space $(M_p(\mathbb{R}), \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R}))$ where $\mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R})$ denotes the Borel σ-algebra generated by the vague topology. A point process is called *simple* if $\mathscr{P}(\{x\}) \leq 1$ a.s., i.e., supported on simple point measures. An oft-used example of a point process is the Poisson point process.

Definition 2.7. *Let $\mu : \mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty)$ be locally integrable ($\int_A \mu(x)dx < \infty$ for all bounded $A \subset \mathbb{R}$). A point process $\mathscr{P}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ is said to be a* Poisson point process *with intensity function μ if the following two properties hold.*

1. *If $A_1, \ldots, A_m \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ are disjoint, then $\mathscr{P}(A_1), \ldots, \mathscr{P}(A_m)$ are independent random variables.*
2. *For any $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $\mathscr{P}(A)$ is a Poisson random variable with mean $\int_A \mu(x)dx$.*

Definition 2.8. *Let $\mathscr{P}_n, \mathscr{P}$ be point processes on $\mathbb{R}$. These processes need not be defined on the same probability space. We will say that $\mathscr{P}_n$ converges weakly to $\mathscr{P}$, denoted $\mathscr{P}_n \Rightarrow \mathscr{P}$, if*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\mathscr{P}_n)] \to \mathbb{E}[f(\mathscr{P})]$$

for all continuous and bounded $f : (M_p(\mathbb{R}), \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R})) \to \mathbb{R}$. This is equivalent to saying

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\{\mathscr{P}_n \in A\} = \mathbb{P}\{\mathscr{P} \in A\}$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\mathbb{P}\{\mathscr{P} \in \partial A\} = 0$. Here ∂A denotes the boundary of A.

An alternative topology on $M_p(\mathbb{R})$ that arises naturally in computational topology is the so-called *bottleneck distance* d_B. Note that we require a modified definition for point measures in $\mathbb{R}$ rather than the more standard definition for persistence diagrams (e.g. [11, 25]).

Definition 2.9. *For $m_1, m_2 \in M_p(\mathbb{R})$*

$$d_B(m_1, m_2) := \inf_{\gamma} \sup_{x:supp(m_1)} |x - \gamma(x)|,$$

where the infimum is over all possible bijections $\gamma : supp(m_1) \to supp(m_2)$ between the multi-sets. If no bijection exists, set $d_B(m_1, m_2) = \infty$.

Though this is not a metric in the classical sense, taking $\min\{d_B, 1\}$ we get a metric on $M_p(\mathbb{R})$. More importantly, the topology induced by d_B and $\min\{d_B, 1\}$ are the same. We shall prove in Lemma A.2 that this topology is stronger than that of vague topology.

3. Minimal spanning acycles

Recall the notion of spanning acycles from Definition 1.4. This section explores many interesting combinatorial properties of (minimal) spanning acycles which are of independent interest. To avoid tedium, we do not always single out the results for the case of minimal spanning tree, i.e., $d = 1$. Since these are classical results in combinatorial optimization and graph theory, one can refer to [17, 66] for graph-theoretic (and expectedly simpler) proofs of these results for the minimal spanning tree. However, we mention that our proofs do not need any modification for the case $d = 1$. We start with elementary simplicial homology results that will be used often in the paper. The following lemma is a corollary of Lemma 2.4.

Corollary 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a simplicial complex with $S_1 \subset S_2 \subset \mathcal{F}^d$. Then*

$$\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1}) \geq \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1) \geq \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_2) \geq \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^d) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) \geq 0.$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a simplicial complex, $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}$ be a d-face and let $S_1 \subset S_2 \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ be such that $\sigma \notin S_2$. If σ is a positive face for $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1$, then σ is a positive face for $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_2$ as well. Conversely, if σ is a negative face for $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_2$, then σ is a negative face for $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1$ as well.*

Proof. If σ is a positive face for $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1$, then it follows from (2.6) that $\partial\sigma \in \partial(C_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1))$. Since $\partial(C_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1)) \subset \partial(C_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_2))$, from (2.6), we have that σ is positive for $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_2$. The second statement follows from negation of the implication since a simplex must be either positive or negative. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a simplicial complex. For all $S \subset \mathcal{F}^d$, if $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) = m > \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K})$ then there exists a $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d \setminus S$ such that $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S \cup \sigma) = m - 1$.*

Proof. Let $S \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ such that $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) = m > \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K})$ and suppose that all $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d \setminus S$ are positive faces w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$. Let $S_1 \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ be such that $S_1 \supset S$. Then from Lemma 3.2, we have that any $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d \setminus S_1$ is positive w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1$. From this, we have $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S)$ for any $S_1 \supset S$. Taking $S_1 = \mathcal{F}^d$, we obtain the necessary contradiction that $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S)$. Hence there is a negative face $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d \setminus S$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$. □

3.1. **Basic properties.** From Corollary 3.1, we get the following necessary condition for existence of a spanning acycle: If a spanning acycle exists for a complex $\mathcal{K}$, then $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$. We shortly prove that it is sufficient as well. From Definition 1.4, Corollary 3.1 and Lemma 2.4, we get the converse to Lemma 3.3 which applies to spanning acycles as well.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $S \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ be such that $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K})$. Then any $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d \setminus S$ is a positive face w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$. In particular, this holds when S is a spanning acycle.*

It is known that the bases of a matroid have the same cardinality called *the rank*. Thus the cardinality of any maximal acycle is the same and we now show that it can be expressed explicitly. For a complex $\mathcal{K}$, let $\gamma_d(\mathcal{K}) := f_d(\mathcal{K}) - \beta_d(\mathcal{K}^d)$. By evaluating $\chi(\mathcal{K}^d) - \chi(\mathcal{K}^{d-1})$ using the Euler-Poincaré formula (2.2), we derive that

$$\gamma_d(\mathcal{K}) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1}) - \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^d) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1}) - \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}), \tag{3.1}$$

where the later equality follows from Corollary 3.1. Another use of Euler-Poincaré formula gives us the following neat result that is a slight generalization of [33, Lemma 3.4] though the proof is very much the same.

Lemma 3.5. *For a simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}$ and a subset $S \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ of d-faces, any two of the following three statements imply the third.*

(1) $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K})$.
(2) $\beta_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) = 0$.
(3) $|S| = \gamma_d(\mathcal{K})$.

Proof. By applying the Euler-Poincaré formula to $(-1)^d[\chi(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) - \chi(\mathcal{K}^d)]$ and re-arranging the terms, we derive the below identity which proves the lemma.

$$\beta_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) + \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}) - |S| - \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) + \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

□

In particular, if $S \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ is a spanning acycle of a simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}$ with $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$, then we get using (3.1) that $|S| = f_d(\mathcal{K}) - \beta_d(\mathcal{K}^d) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1})$.

As mentioned earlier, the next result shows that $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$ is a sufficient condition for the existence of a spanning acycle. Enroute, we also prove that any two of the three conditions in Lemma 3.5 characterize maximal acycles as well as show that the rank of the matroid of acycles, i.e., the cardinality of a maximal acycle, is nothing but $\gamma_d(\mathcal{K})$. In case of $d = 1$, a maximal acycle is nothing but a maximal spanning forest of the graph $\mathcal{K}$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a simplicial complex. Then every maximal acycle of $d-$faces has cardinality $\gamma_d(\mathcal{K})$. Consequently, if $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$, we have that there exists a spanning acycle.*

Proof. By Corollary 3.1, $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1) - \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) \geq 0$ for any $S_1 \subset \mathcal{F}^d$. Using this in (3.2), $|S_1| \leq \gamma_d(\mathcal{K})$ for any acycle $S_1 \subset \mathcal{F}^d$. Hence, to show the desired result, it now suffices to show that there exists an acycle with cardinality $\gamma_d(\mathcal{K})$.

From (3.1), $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1}) = \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}) + \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K})$. Since, by definition, $\gamma_d(\mathcal{K}) \geq 0$, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that, starting with an empty set, we can inductively construct a set $S \subset \mathcal{F}^d$

such that $|S| = \gamma_d(\mathcal{K})$ and $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K})$. By Lemma 3.5, it follows that $\beta_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) = 0$ implying that S is an acycle with $|S| = \gamma_d(\mathcal{K})$ as desired. If $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$, then this S is also a spanning acycle. □

The above two lemmas characterize $d-$maximal acycles as well as their cardinality. In the proof of Lemma 3.5, it was essential to work with the restriction of $\mathcal{K}$ to its $d-$skeleton, i.e., $\mathcal{K}^d$. We now give alternate expressions in which there is no need for this restriction. As before, let $\mathcal{K}$ be a simplicial complex and let $d \geq 0$. Since $f_{d+1}(\mathcal{K}^d) = 0$, we have that $b_d(\mathcal{K}^d) = 0$ and so $\beta_d(\mathcal{K}^d) = z_d(\mathcal{K}^d) = z_d(\mathcal{K}) = \beta_d(\mathcal{K}) + b_d(\mathcal{K})$. Combining this with the fact that $f_d(\mathcal{K}) = z_d(\mathcal{K}) + b_{d-1}(\mathcal{K})$ and $\gamma_d(\mathcal{K}) = f_d(\mathcal{K}) - \beta_d(\mathcal{K}^d)$, we get that

$$\gamma_d(\mathcal{K}) = b_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}). \tag{3.3}$$

Separately, using (3.1) for $d+1$ and $\gamma_d(\mathcal{K}) = f_d(\mathcal{K}) - \beta_d(\mathcal{K}^d)$, we get that

$$\gamma_d(\mathcal{K}) = f_d(\mathcal{K}) - \beta_d(\mathcal{K}) - \gamma_{d+1}(\mathcal{K}). \tag{3.4}$$

As $b_d(\mathcal{K})$ is monotone, it follows from (3.3) that $\gamma_d(\mathcal{K})$ is also monotone, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{K}_1 \subset \mathcal{K}_2 \;\Rightarrow\; \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1) \leq \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_2). \tag{3.5}$$

By using the submodular inequality for ranks of matroids (see [65, Sec 1.6]), we get that for any two complexes $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2$ such that $\mathcal{K}_1^{d-1} = \mathcal{K}_2^{d-1}$ (i.e., they differ only in faces with dimension d and above)

$$\gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1) + \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_2) \geq \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2) + \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2).$$

We now strengthen this to a neat equality which is applicable in greater generality.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2$ be two complexes and let $d \geq 0$. Then*

$$\gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1) + \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_2) = \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2) + \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2) + \beta(\ker \nu_{d-1}), \tag{3.6}$$

where $\nu_{d-1} : \mathrm{H}_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2) \to \mathrm{H}_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}_1) \oplus \mathrm{H}_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}_2)$ is the induced linear map.

Proof. The identity (3.6) trivially holds for $d > \dim(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2)$ since all expressions on the right and left are zero. Let $d \leq \dim(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2)$. The key tool now is the identity (2.3) for Betti numbers. Substituting (3.4) in (2.3), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} f_d(\mathcal{K}_1) - \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1) - \gamma_{d+1}(\mathcal{K}_1) + f_d(\mathcal{K}_2) - \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_2) - \gamma_{d+1}(\mathcal{K}_2) = \\ f_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2) - \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2) - \gamma_{d+1}(\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2) - \beta(\ker \nu_d) + \\ f_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2) - \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2) - \gamma_{d+1}(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2) - \beta(\ker \nu_{d-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The f_d terms cancel out due to inclusion-exclusion and hence the expression simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1) + \gamma_{d+1}(\mathcal{K}_1) + \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_2) + \gamma_{d+1}(\mathcal{K}_2) = & \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2) + \gamma_{d+1}(\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2) + \beta(\ker \nu_d) + \\ & \gamma_d(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2) + \gamma_{d+1}(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2) + \beta(\ker \nu_{d-1}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Firstly, let $d = dim(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2)$ and so $\gamma_{d+1}(\cdot) = 0$ for all $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2, \mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2, \mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2$. Furthermore, by exactness $\beta(\ker \nu_d) = 0$. Substituting into (3.7), we obtain (3.6) for $d = dim(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2)$.

From (3.7), it is easy to see that if (3.6) holds for $d+1$, then it holds for d as well. Using this recursively and that (3.6) holds for $d = dim(\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2)$, the proof follows. □

Lemma 3.8 (Exchange property)**.** *Let $S \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ be a spanning acycle of a simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}$ and let $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d \setminus S$. Then, for any d-face $\sigma_1 \in S$ such that σ_1 is part of a d-cycle containing σ, $S \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1$ is also a spanning acycle.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.4, $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d \setminus S$ is a positive face w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$. So $\beta_d(\mathcal{K} \cup S \cup \sigma) = 1$. Let $\mathscr{C}$ be the d-cycle in $S \cup \sigma$. Clearly, $\sigma \in \mathscr{C}$. So $\sum_{\tau \in \mathscr{C} \cap S} a_\tau \partial\tau = -\partial\sigma$ for some collection of non-zero $\mathbb{F}-$valued coefficients $\{a_\tau\}$.

Suppose that for $\sigma_1 \in S$, $S \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1$ is not a spanning acycle. Then by Lemma 2.4, we obtain that $\beta_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1) = 1$. Let $\mathscr{C}_1$ be the d-cycle in $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1$. Clearly, $\mathscr{C}_1 \not\subset S$ as S is a spanning acycle. Hence $\sigma \in \mathscr{C}_1$ and we derive that for some collection of non-zero $a'_\tau \in \mathbb{F}$, $\sum_{\tau \in (\mathscr{C}_1 \cap S)} a'_\tau \partial\tau = -\partial\sigma$. Setting $a_\tau = 0$ for $\tau \in \mathscr{C}_1 \setminus \mathscr{C}$ and similarly for a'_τ, we derive that

$$\sum_{\tau \in (\mathscr{C} \cup \mathscr{C}_1) \cap S} (a'_\tau - a_\tau)\partial\tau = \sum_{\tau \in (\mathscr{C}_1 \cap S)} a_\tau \partial\tau - \sum_{\tau \in (\mathscr{C} \cap S)} a_\tau \partial\tau = \partial\sigma - \partial\sigma = 0.$$

But since S is a spanning acycle, the above implies that $\forall \tau \in (\mathscr{C} \cup \mathscr{C}_1) \cap S$, $a_\tau = a'_\tau$ and hence $\mathscr{C}_1 = \mathscr{C}$. So, we have that $\sigma_1 \notin \mathscr{C}$ if $S \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1$ is not a spanning acycle. By contraposition, we have that if $\sigma_1 \in \mathscr{C}$, then $S \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1$ is a spanning acycle. □

Lemma 3.9. *Let $S_1, S_2 \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ be two distinct spanning acycles of a simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}$ and let $\sigma_1 \in S_1 \setminus S_2$, a d-face. Then, there exists a d-face $\sigma_2 \in S_2$ such that $S_1 \cup \sigma_2 \setminus \sigma_1$ is also a spanning acycle.*

Proof. Clearly, $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1 \setminus \sigma_1) = 1$ and $\beta_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1 \setminus \sigma_1) = 0$. As S_2 is a spanning acycle, $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_2 \cup S_1 \setminus \sigma_1) = 0$. From the β_{d-1} relations, it follows that there exists $\sigma_2 \in S_2$ and $S'_2 \subset S_2$ such that σ_2 is negative w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S'_2 \cup S_1 \setminus \sigma_1$. So by Lemma 3.2, we have that σ_2 is also a negative face for $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1 \setminus \sigma_1$. Hence by Lemma 2.4, $\beta_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1 \cup \sigma_2 \setminus \sigma_1) = 0$. It thus follows that $S_1 \cup \sigma_2 \setminus \sigma_1$ is also a spanning acycle. □

Lemma 3.10 (Cycle property)**.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a weighted simplicial complex having a cycle $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathcal{F}^d$. Let $\sigma_1 \in \mathscr{C}$ be such that its weight is strictly larger than other that of the other d-faces in C. Then $\sigma_1 \notin M$ for any minimal spanning acycle M.*

Proof. Let M be a minimal spanning acycle on $\mathcal{K}$ such that $\sigma_1 \in M$. Clearly $\mathscr{C} \not\subset M$. Hence there exists $\sigma \in \mathscr{C} \setminus M$. From Lemma 3.8, it follows that $M \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1$ is a spanning acycle. But $w(M \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1) < w(M)$, a contradiction. This proves the desired result. □

Lemma 3.11 (Uniqueness)**.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a simplicial complex weighted by $w : \mathcal{K} \to \mathbb{R}$ which is injective on $\mathcal{F}^d$. If a minimal spanning acycle exists, then it must be unique.*

Proof. Suppose that S and M are two distinct minimal spanning acycles. Let σ be the d-face with least weight such that $\sigma \in S \triangle M$ and without loss of generality, assume $\sigma \in S$. Then there is a $d-$cycle $\mathscr{C} \subset M \cup \sigma$ such that $\sigma \in \mathscr{C}$. Since $\mathscr{C} \not\subset S$, there exists a d-face $\sigma_1 \in M \setminus S$ that is part of a d-cycle containing σ. By the choice of σ, $w(\sigma_1) > w(\sigma)$. From Lemma 3.8, $M \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1$ is a spanning cycle. But $w(M \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1) < w(M)$, a contradiction. □

Remark 3.12. *Suppose the weight function w is not injective on $\mathcal{F}^d$ but nevertheless monotonic on $\mathcal{K}$. Then as discussed in Remark 2.6, this weight function shall yield a total order on $\mathcal{K}$ and so on $\mathcal{F}^d$ as well. In such a case, the above theorem guarantees that the minimal spanning acycle is unique with respect to the chosen total order.*

3.2. **Algorithms.** Having investigated some basic properties of minimal spanning acycles, we now turn to the question of algorithms to generate a minimal spanning acycle. Again, we take our inspiration from the spanning tree and matroid literature. One of the properties enjoyed by matroids is the fact that greedy algorithms can be designed to output a minimal basis [65, Chapter 19]. The greedy algorithm for matroids is an extension of the well-known Kruskal's algorithm [44] to generate minimal spanning trees. We shall describe here this algorithm for simplicial complexes. We later also extend the Jarník-Prim-Dijkstra's algorithm [38, 57, 23]. As with minimal spanning trees, we emphasize that these algorithms are important in theoretical analysis of minimal spanning acycles but for actual generation of minimal spanning acycles, it might be possible to design better algorithms.

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a simplicial complex weighted by $w : \mathcal{K} \to \mathbb{R}$. By Lemma 2.4, every $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d$ is either positive or negative, but not both, with respect to a subcomplex $\mathcal{K}_1$ such that $\sigma \notin \mathcal{K}_1$. Using this, we give the simplicial Kruskal's algorithm below.

Algorithm 2 Simplicial Kruskal's Algorithm

Input: $d \geq 1$, $\mathcal{K}, w$
Main Procedure:
set $S = \emptyset$, $F = \mathcal{F}^d$
while $F \neq \emptyset$ and $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) \neq 0$

- remove a face σ with minimum weight from F (w.r.t. $<_l$).
- if σ is negative w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$, then add σ to S.

Output $M = S$.

Theorem 3.13. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a weighted simplicial complex with $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$ and let M be the output of the simplicial Kruskal's algorithm. Then, M is a minimal spanning acycle.*

Proof. We shall assume that the weight function w is injective. For the general case, similar arguments can be carried out by using Remarks 2.6 and 3.12. From Lemmas 3.6 and 3.11, it follows that there is a unique minimal spanning acycle which we denote by M_1.

We now show that M is a spanning acycle. Clearly, $\beta_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1}) = 0$ and by our algorithm and Lemma 2.4, it remains the same at every stage of the algorithm and so $\beta_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M) = 0$, proving that M is an acycle. Clearly, each face in $\mathcal{F}^d \setminus M$ is positive with respect to $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M$. Hence, M is spanning as using Lemma 3.2 we have that

$$\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M \cup \mathcal{F}^d \setminus M) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0,$$

For the proof of minimality, we argue as in the Kruskal's algorithm for minimal spanning tree. We prove that at any stage of the algorithm, $S \subset M_1$. Assuming that the above claim is true, $M \subset M_1$. Since M and M_1 are both spanning acycles, $M_1 = M$.

We shall prove the claim inductively. Trivially, this is true for $S = \emptyset$. Suppose that the claim holds for S at some stage of the algorithm i.e., $S \subset M_1$ but $S \subsetneq M$. This implies that there does exist a $d-$face in $\mathcal{F}^d \setminus S$ which is negative w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$ and hence, from Lemma 3.4, $S \neq M_1$. Let σ be the next face that is added to S and suppose that $\sigma \notin M_1$. Clearly $\beta_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M_1 \cup \sigma) = 1$. Hence there exists a $d-$cycle $\mathscr{C}$ in $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M_1 \cup \sigma$ containing σ. Since $\beta_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S \cup \sigma) = 0$, $\mathscr{C} \not\subset S \cup \sigma$ and so there exists $\sigma_1 \in \mathscr{C} \cap M_1 \setminus S$. Clearly, either $w(\sigma) < w(\sigma_1)$ or $w(\sigma) > w(\sigma_1)$ as w is injective. Suppose that $w(\sigma) < w(\sigma_1)$. From Lemma 3.8, it follows that $M_1 \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1$ is spanning acycle with $w(M_1 \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1) < w(M_1)$, a contradiction. Suppose that $w(\sigma) > w(\sigma_1)$. Since $S \subsetneq M_1$, $\sigma_1 \in M_1 \setminus S$, and M_1 is a spanning acycle, σ_1 is negative w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$ by Lemma 3.2. Thus, it follows that the algorithm would have chosen σ_1 before σ, a contradiction and hence proves the claim. □

As with minimal spanning trees, the Kruskals' algorithm has a number of useful consequences. We shall list some consequences now and defer the more important consequences to the next two sections. We first define a (topological) notion of a *cut* for simplicial complexes.

Definition 3.14 (Cut)**.** *Let $d \geq 1$. Given a simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}$ with $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$, a subset $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ is a cut if $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K} - \mathscr{C}) > 0$ and for any $\mathscr{C}_1 \subsetneq \mathscr{C}$, $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K} - \mathscr{C}_1) < \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K} - \mathscr{C})$.*

Lemma 3.15 (Cut Property)**.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a weighted simplicial complex with $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$. Let $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathcal{F}^d$ be a cut. Then $\mathscr{C} \cap S \neq \emptyset$ for any spanning acycle S and every minimum weight face in $\mathscr{C}$ belongs to some minimal spanning acycle.*

Proof. The first conclusion follows from the definition of cut and Lemma 3.3. Now for the second part. Let σ_1 be a minimum weight face in the cut $\mathscr{C}$ and let $<_l$ be a total order in which this is the unique minimum weight face in the cut $\mathscr{C}$. Consider the simplicial Kruskal's algorithm under this $<_l$ and let S_1 be the acycle constructed when σ_1 is the minimum weight face in F. Clearly $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1 \subset \mathcal{K} - \mathscr{C}$. Setting $\mathscr{C}_1 = \mathscr{C} \setminus \sigma_1$, the cut property implies that

$$\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K} - \mathscr{C}_1) < \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K} - \mathscr{C}).$$

Thus σ_1 is negative w.r.t. $\mathcal{K} - \mathscr{C}$ and, by Lemma 3.2, is also negative w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S_1$. Hence σ_1 will be added to the minimal spanning acycle by the simplicial Kruskal's algorithm . □

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a simplicial complex and let $\tau \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}$. Then $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d$ is said to be a coface of τ, if $\tau \subset \sigma$. Since the set of all cofaces of a $(d-1)$-face form a cut, the below result is immediate.

Corollary 3.16. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a weighted simplicial complex with $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$. Then for any spanning acycle S, supp(∂S) is the set of all $(d-1)$-faces with a d-coface. Further, let $\tau \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{K})$ and $\sigma_0 = \arg\min\{w(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K}), \tau \subset \sigma.\}$. Then $\sigma_0 \in M$ for some minimal spanning acycle M.*

Lemma 3.17. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a weighted simplicial complex and let $\mathcal{K}_1 \subset \mathcal{K}$ be a subcomplex. Further, let $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}_1) = 0$ and M be the minimal spanning acycle on $\mathcal{K}$ with respect to some total order $<_l$. Then there exists a minimal spanning acycle M_1 on $\mathcal{K}_1$ such that $M \cap \mathcal{K}_1 \subset M_1$.*

Proof. We first fix a total order $<_l$ on $\mathcal{K}$ and hence on $\mathcal{K}_1$ as well. Let M be the minimal spanning acycle chosen with respect to this total order $<_l$ (see Remark 3.12). Let $\sigma \in M \cap \mathcal{K}_1$. Consider $\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-), \mathcal{K}_1(\sigma^-)$ with respect to $<_l$ as in Remark 2.6. Since the simplicial Kruskal's algorithm generates the minimal spanning acycle M (Theorem 3.13), and since $\sigma \in M$, it follows that σ is negative w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)$. Combining this with the fact that $\mathcal{K}_1(\sigma^-) \subset \mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)$, it follows from Lemma 3.2 that σ is also negative face w.r.t $\mathcal{K}_1(\sigma-)$. So the simplicial Kruskal's algorithm for $\mathcal{K}_1$ would necessarily choose σ. The desired result now follows. □

Algorithm 3 Simplicial Prims's Algorithm

Input: $d \geq 1$, $\mathcal{K}$, w
Main Procedure:
Choose an arbitrary $(d-1)$-simplex σ
Set $S = \emptyset$, $Marked = \emptyset$, $V = \sigma$
while $Marked \neq \mathcal{K}^d$ and $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S) \neq 0$

- $G \leftarrow$ cofaces(V)
- $G = G - Marked$
- $\tau \leftarrow \arg\min_G f(G)$ (w.r.t. $<_l$)
- if τ is negative w.r.t. $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$ then $S = S \cup \tau$.
- $Marked = Marked \cup \tau$
- $V = V \cup \text{supp}(\partial\tau)$

Output $M = S$.

We now discuss the Jarnìk-Prim-Dijkstra's algorithm to generate minimal spanning acycles on weighted simplicial complexes. The details are given in Algorithm 3. The algorithm begins at an arbitrary $(d-1)$-face, analogous to beginning at an arbitrary vertex in the 1-D (graph) case and greedily collects 'nearest' $d-$faces that do not create a cycle. The set V serves as the higher dimensional proxy for the connected component in the 1-D case. Before we prove the correctness of the algorithm, we mention that this algorithm is a local greedy algorithm in contrast to Kruskal's algorithm which is a global greedy algorithm and hence this is more suitable for generating minimal spanning acycles on infinite complexes. Indeed, this procedure is used to define minimal spanning trees on infinite graphs in [1, Lemma 1].

Prim's algorithm is related to hypergraph connectivity which we define now.

Definition 3.18 (Hypergraph connectivity)**.** *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a simplicial complex and let $d \geq 1$. Let $G_d^H(\mathcal{K})$ be the graph with vertex set $V = \mathcal{F}^{d-1}$ and edge set*

$$E = \{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1} \times \mathcal{F}^{d-1} : \sigma_1 \cup \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{F}^d\}.$$

A set $S \subset \mathcal{F}^{d-1}$ is said to be d-hypergraph connected in $\mathcal{K}$ if S is connected in $G_d^H(\mathcal{K})$. The complex $\mathcal{K}$ is said to be d-hypergraph connected if $G_d^H(\mathcal{K})$ is connected.

When the dimension associated is clear, we shall speak of hypergraph connectivity omitting the dimension. We start with a crucial lemma for our hypergraph connectivity results.

Lemma 3.19. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a d-complex. Suppose $\mathscr{C}$ is a d-acycle in $\mathcal{K}$ such that $\mathscr{C} \cup \sigma$ is a d-cycle (i.e., there is a d-chain in $Z_d(\mathcal{K})$ whose support is $\mathscr{C} \cup \sigma$ and no d-chain in $Z_d(\mathcal{K})$ has support $\mathscr{C}$) then $supp(\partial\mathscr{C})$ is d-hypergraph connected in $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup \mathscr{C}$. As a consequence $supp(\partial\sigma) \subset supp(\partial\mathscr{C})$ is also d-hypergraph connected in $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup \mathscr{C}$.*

Proof. Let σ and $\mathscr{C}$ be as assumed. This means that there exists field coefficients $a_\tau, \tau \in \mathscr{C}$ (all non-trivial) such that $\partial\sigma + \sum_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}} a_\tau \partial\tau = 0$ but for all field coefficients $b_\tau, \tau \in \mathscr{C}$ (not all trivial) $\sum_{\tau\in\mathscr{C}} b_\tau \partial\tau \neq 0$.

If $supp(\partial\mathscr{C})$ be not hypergraph connected in $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup \mathscr{C}$ then so is $\mathcal{F}^{d-1}$. So, let $\mathcal{F}^{d-1} = A_1 \cup B_1$ such that there is no $\tau \in \mathscr{C}$ such that $supp(\partial\tau) \cap A_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $supp(\partial\tau) \cap B_1 \neq \emptyset$. Thus we can partition $\mathscr{C}$ into subsets A and B depending upon whether $supp(\partial\tau) \subset A_1$ or $supp(\partial\tau) \subset B_1$ respectively. Thus we get that $\mathscr{C} = A \cup B$ with $A \cap B = \emptyset$. By definition of $\mathscr{C}$, we have that $A \cup \sigma$ and $B \cup \sigma$ are acyclic. We shall now derive a contradiction by showing that $\mathscr{C} \cup \sigma$ is acyclic.

Define the complexes $\mathcal{K}_A := \mathcal{K}^{d-2} \cup A_1, \mathcal{K}_B = \mathcal{K}^{d-2} \cup B_1$ and $\mathcal{K}_\sigma := \{\tau \in \mathcal{K} : \tau \subset \sigma\}$ i.e., σ viewed as a complete d-complex. Note that $\mathcal{K}_A \cup \mathcal{K}_B = \mathcal{K}^{d-1}$ and $\mathcal{K}_A \cap \mathcal{K}_B = \mathcal{K}^{d-2}$. Now to show $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup \mathscr{C} \cup \sigma$ is acyclic, we use the Mayer-Vietoris long exact sequence (see Lemma 2.1). We set $\mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{K}_A \cup A \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma$ and $\mathcal{K}_2 = \mathcal{K}_B \cup B \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma$. By definition of A_1, B_1, A, B, we have that $\mathcal{K}_1$ and $\mathcal{K}_2$ are both complexes. Further, we have that $\mathcal{K}_1 \cup \mathcal{K}_2 = \mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup \mathscr{C} \cup \sigma$ and $\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2 = \mathcal{K}^{d-2} \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma$. Thus applying the Mayer-Vietoris long exact sequence, we have

$$\cdots \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-2} \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_d(\mathcal{K}_A \cup A \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma) \oplus \mathrm{H}_d(\mathcal{K}_B \cup B \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup \mathscr{C} \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-2} \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma) \longrightarrow \cdots$$

Since $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2$ are acyclic, acyclicity of $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup \mathscr{C} \cup \sigma$ follows from exactness of the above sequence and the fact that $\mathrm{H}_d(\mathcal{K}^{d-2} \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma)$ and $\mathrm{H}_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-2} \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma)$ are both trivial. The triviality of the latter two homology groups follows from noting that $\mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K}^{d-2} \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma) = \{\sigma\}, \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^{d-2} \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma) = supp(\partial\sigma), \mathcal{F}^{d-2}(\mathcal{K}^{d-2} \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma) = \mathcal{F}^{d-2}(\mathcal{K})$ i.e., $\mathcal{K}^{d-2} \cup \mathcal{K}_\sigma$ is nothing but $(d-2)$-skeleton of a complex with one d-simplex attached. □

Proposition 3.20. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a $d-$hypergraph connected simplicial complex with $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$. Then the subcomplex $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$ is d-hypergraph connected for any spanning acycle S.*

Proof. Excluding the trivial case of $S = \mathcal{F}^d$, let $S \subsetneq \mathcal{F}^d$. Then there exists $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d \setminus S$. Then S is a d-acycle in $\mathcal{K}_* = \mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S \cup \sigma$ such that $S \cup \sigma$ is a d-cycle in $\mathcal{K}_*$ by Lemma 3.2. Since $\mathcal{K}$ is hypergraph connected, by corollary 3.16, we have that $\mathcal{F}^{d-1} = supp(\partial S)$ and by Lemma 3.19, $supp(\partial S)$ is hypergraph connected in $\mathcal{K}_* \setminus \sigma = \mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$ as needed. □

As a special case, consider a d-dimensional complex $\mathcal{K}$ on n vertices with a complete $(d-1)$-skeleton, i.e., $|\mathcal{F}^{d-1}| = \binom{n}{d}$. Suppose that $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$. By Lemma 3.6, there exists a spanning acycle $S \subset \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K})$. Clearly S is also a spanning acycle for the complete d-complex $\mathcal{K}^*$ and $\mathcal{K}^*$ is clearly d-hypergraph connected. Hence $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$ is d-hypergraph connected and since d-hypergraph connectivity is preserved under addition of d-faces, we get that $\mathcal{K}$ is also d-hypergraph connected. Thus, we have shown that a d-dimensional complex $\mathcal{K}$ on n

vertices with a complete $(d-1)$-skeleton and $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$ is d-hypergraph connected. This is nothing but [41, Theorem 1.7]. In fact the above arguments can be easily repeated to extend both Proposition 3.20 and [41, Theorem 1.7] to the following corollary.

Corollary 3.21. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a simplicial complex such that $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$ and there exists a d-hypergraph connected complex $\mathcal{K}_1$ such that $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{K}_1$ with $\mathcal{K}_1^{d-1} = \mathcal{K}^{d-1}$. Then $\mathcal{K}$ is also d-hypergraph connected.*

Theorem 3.22. *Prim's algorithm returns the minimal spanning acycle if $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$ and $\mathcal{K}$ is d-hypergraph connected.*

Proof. We proceed as in the proof of simplicial Kruskal's algorithm. So, we shall again only prove under the assumption that the d-faces have unique weights and then appeal to Remarks 2.6 and 3.12 to extend the proof to the general case. Again, the assumption of unique weights on $\mathcal{F}^d$, guarantees existence of a unique minimal spanning tree (Lemmas 3.6 and 3.11) which we denote by M_1.

We first note that all d-simplices are considered during the execution of Prim's algorithm. This follows from the assumption of hypergraph connectivity. Regardless of the starting place, all $(d-1)$-simplices will be placed in the set V by the assumption of hypergraph connectivity. Therefore, all cofaces, i.e., d-simplices, will be considered. This also implies that the algorithm terminates. Further, same argument as that in the proof of Kruskal's algorithm will give that M is a spanning acycle.

It remains to argue minimality of M. This also we shall do inductively as in the proof of Kruskal's algorithm. We shall show that at every stage of the algorithm $S \subset M_1$. This certainly holds for the initial step $S = \emptyset$. Let S be the spanning acycle constructed at some intermediate step (called current step in rest of the proof) of the algorithm, i.e., $S \subsetneq M$ and $S \subset M_1$. Suppose that σ be the next d-face added to S and suppose $\sigma \notin M_1$. This implies that all d-faces considered after the current step but before σ were positive faces with respect to $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$. Also, $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M_1 \cup \sigma$ contains a d-cycle $\mathscr{C}$ and for all $\sigma_1 \in \mathscr{C} \setminus \sigma$, $M_1 \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1$ is a spanning acycle by the exchange property (Lemma 3.8). Note that $\mathscr{C} \subsetneq S \cup \sigma$ since $S \cup (\mathscr{C} \setminus \sigma) \subset M_1$. Because of unique weights, $w(\sigma) < w(\sigma_1)$ or $w(\sigma) > w(\sigma_1)$. The former possibility leads to an easy contradiction as $w(M_1 \cup \sigma \setminus \sigma_1) < w(M_1)$. Thus we have that $w(\sigma) > w(\sigma_1)$ for all $\sigma_1 \in \mathscr{C} \setminus \sigma$ from which also we shall derive a contradiction.

Define S^* consists of those d-simplices that are d-hypergraph connected to $supp(\partial S)$ via d-faces of strictly lower weight than σ. More formally,

$$S^* = \{\tau \in \mathcal{F}^d \backslash S : w(\tau) < w(\sigma), supp(\partial\tau) \text{ is } d\text{-hypergraph connected to } supp(\partial S) \text{ in } \mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)\}.$$

The Prim's algorithm shall consider all d-faces in S^* before considering σ.

Since $\mathscr{C}$ is a cycle and $\mathscr{C} \setminus \sigma$ is an acycle, $supp(\partial(\mathscr{C} \setminus \sigma))$ is d-hypergraph connected in $\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)$ by Lemma 3.19. Since $supp(\partial\sigma) \subset supp(\partial(\mathscr{C} \setminus \sigma))$ and $supp(\partial\sigma) \cap supp(\partial S) \neq \emptyset$, we have that $supp(\partial(\mathscr{C} \setminus \sigma)) \cap supp(\partial S) \neq \emptyset$. Hence, $\mathscr{C} \setminus (S \cup \sigma) \subset S^*$. Thus, the Prim's algorithm shall consider all d-faces in $\mathscr{C} \setminus (S \cup \sigma)$ before considering σ.

Now we divide into two cases. Suppose all $\tau \in \mathscr{C} \setminus (S \cup \sigma)$ were considered at a stage of the Prim's algorithm before the current step, then since $S \cup (\mathscr{C} \setminus \sigma)$ is acyclic, by Lemma 3.2

each τ should have been added to the spanning acycle at that stage of the algorithm leading to the contradiction that $\tau \in S$.

Consider the next case that there exists a $\tau \in \mathscr{C} \setminus (S \cup \sigma)$ which is considered at a step after the current step. As $\tau \in S^*$, τ is considered before σ by the Prim's algorithm. Since σ is the next d-simplex added after S, the acycle at the step when τ is considered is still S. But since $S \cup (\mathscr{C} \setminus \sigma)$ is acyclic, τ is a negative face with respect to $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup S$ and thus τ is added to S contradicting the fact σ is the next d-face added to S.

Thus we get that $\sigma \in M_1$ and hence $S \cup \{\sigma\} \subset M_1$ completing the proof. □

3.3. **Persistence Diagrams and Minimal Spanning Acycles.** Here we highlight the connection between persistence diagrams and minimal spanning acycles. The minimal spanning acycle represents the persistence boundary basis w.r.t. the sublevel set filtration induced by weights on the simplices. To illustrate this explicitly, we first recount the incremental algorithm for Betti numbers from [22]. From the decomposition of a filtration into persistence diagram, it follows that a positive simplex generates a new homology class and hence forms a new cycle, while a negative simplex bounds an existing homology class and hence is a boundary. The incremental algorithm distinguishes between the two cases by constructing a set of basis vectors for the (graded) boundary operator in the order of the filtration. In this setting, the boundary of each simplex is reduced w.r.t. the existing basis and if it is found to be linearly independent, it is a negative simplex and the reduced vector is added to the basis. Since such a simplex does not generate a cycle, it is part of the minimal spanning acycle. By maintaining the basis in this manner, we can simulate Kruskal's algorithm. The fact that we do not add any simplices that generate cycles follows from the fact that by definition the boundary chain of such a simplex reduces to 0. The converse fact, that the existence of a pivot implies that it reduces the $(k-1)$-dimensional Betti number follows from Lemma 2.4. Furthermore, this correspondence highlights that all elements of cycle basis the persistence algorithm returns are of a special form - a linear combination of faces from the minimal spanning acycle and a simplex.

Theorem 3.23. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a weighted d-complex with $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the point-set of death times in the persistence diagram of the $\mathbb{H}_{d-1}(\mathcal{K})$ with the canonical filtration induced by the weights and let $\mathcal{B}$ be the point-set of birth times in the persistence diagram of the $\mathbb{H}_d(\mathcal{K})$ with the canonical filtration induced by the weights. Then we have that*

$$\mathcal{D} = \{w(\sigma) : \sigma \in M\},\ \mathcal{B} = \{w(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d \backslash M\},$$

where M is a d-minimal spanning acycle of $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{F}^d$ are the d-simplices of $\mathcal{K}$.

Proof. We shall only need to prove the result for death times $\mathcal{D}$. Because every d-simplex is either positive or negative with respect to $\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)$ (see (2.7) and (2.8)). Further since by the incremental algorithm (Algorithm 1), negative simplices correspond to death times and positive simplices correspond to birth time ((2.9)), the result for $\mathcal{D}$ implies that for $\mathcal{B}$.

We again only consider the case when the filtration values are unique and appeal to Remark 2.6 to complete the proof in the general case. Note that in the general case, we use the same

total ordering for the incremental algorithm (Algorithm 1) generating death and birth times as well as the simplicial Kruskal's algorithm (Algorithm 2).

By uniqueness of weights on $\mathcal{F}^d$, we know that the Kruskal's algorithm gives us the minimal spanning acycle M. Firstly, note that by the relation (2.5), the condition to add σ to S in Kruskal's algorithm is equivalent to $\partial(C_d(S)) \subsetneq \partial(C_d(S \cup \sigma))$. And similarly, we can observe that the incremental algorithm adds $c = w(\sigma)$ to $\mathcal{D}$ if $\partial(C_d(\mathcal{K}(c-))) \subsetneq \partial(C_d(\mathcal{K}(c-) \cup \sigma))$.

Let c be a value in the filtration, i.e., there exists $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $w(\sigma) = c$. Let $M(c)$ denote the acycle generated by Kruskal's algorithm on $\mathcal{K}(c)$, i.e., $M(c) = M \cap \mathcal{K}(c)$ and similarly, we shall use the notation $M(c-)$ as well. By the above discussion on Kruskal's algorithm and incremental algorithm, our proof is complete if we show that $\partial(C_d(M(c))) = \partial(C_d(\mathcal{K}(c)))$. Trivially, $\partial(C_d(M(c))) \subset \partial(C_d(\mathcal{K}(c)))$ and we shall now show the other inclusion.

Suppose the other inclusion does not hold, then there exists a $\tau \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K}(c)) \setminus M(c)$ such that $\partial\tau \notin \partial(C_d(M(c)))$. Let $w(\tau) = b < c$. Then clearly $\partial\tau \notin \partial(C_d(M(b-)))$ and so by (2.5), τ will be a negative face with respect to $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M(b-)$. So, Kruskal's algorithm would have added σ to the acycle $M(b-)$ contradicting the assumption that $\tau \notin M(c)$. Thus, we have $\partial(C_d(M(c))) = \partial(C_d(\mathcal{K}(c)))$ and the proof is complete. □

The above result has strong applications for random complexes as will be seen in the next section. Firstly, we obtain [33, Theorem 1.1] (see (1.3)) as an easy corollary of our previous theorem and the representation (1.1). Further, we can easily prove a fundamental uniqueness result for minimal spanning acycles relying upon this correspondance and the uniqueness of persistence diagrams [67, Theorem 2.1],[13, Theorem 1.3], [21, Theorem 1.1][6].

Theorem 3.24. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a weighted d-complex such that $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}^d) = 0$ and M_1, M_2 be two d-minimal spanning acycles in $\mathcal{K}$. Let $c \in [0, \infty)$. Then we have that*

$$|\{\sigma \in M_1 : w(\sigma) = c\}| = |\{\sigma \in M_2 : w(\sigma) = c\}|.$$

In the case of unique weights, the minimal spanning acycle is unique making the above theorem trivially true. In the case of non-unique weights, the minimal spanning acycle we obtain will depend on our choice of extension to a total order. However, the above theorem states that the weights of the minimal spanning acycle will be independent of this choice.

We now give an alternative characterization of a minimal spanning acycle that follows from the proof of Theorem 3.23. Such a characterization of a minimal spanning tree has been very useful in the study of minimal spanning trees on infinite graphs ([49, Chapter 11], [2, Proposition 2.1]). A similar characterization for minimal spanning tree is called as *the creek-crossing criterion* in [2]. We have mentioned earlier that simplicial Jarnìk-Prim-Dijkstra's algorithm can also be used to define minimal spanning acycles on infinite complexes analogous to the graph case. However, we wish to point out now that these different characterizations do not coincide even in the infinite graph case ([2, Proposition 2.1]) and so the analogous question for complexes is moot.

[6]Uniqueness follows from certain assumptions on finiteness and the KrullRemakSchmidt theorem of isomorphisms of indecomposible subgroups, which always hold in the setting of finite simplicial complexes.

Lemma 3.25. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a weighted simplicial complex with $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d$ and M be the minimal spanning acycle with respect to a total order $<_l$ extending the partial order induced by w. Then $\sigma \in M$ iff $\partial\sigma \notin \partial(C_d(\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)))$.*

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 3.23, we know that $\partial(C_d(M \cap \mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)) = \partial(C_d(\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-))$. Thus by Kruskal's algorithm and (2.5), we have that $\sigma \in M$ iff $\partial\sigma \notin \partial(C_d(\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)))$. □

Combining Lemma 3.25 with the fact that if $\partial\sigma \in \partial(C_d(\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)))$, then by Lemma 3.19, $\text{supp}(\partial\sigma)$ is $d-$hypergraph connected, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.26. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a weighted simplicial complex with $\beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{K}) = 0$. Let M be the minimal spanning acycle with respect to a total order $<_l$ extending the partial order induced by w and $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d$. If $\text{supp}(\partial\sigma)$ is not $d-$hypergraph connected in $\mathcal{K}(\sigma^-)$, then $\sigma \in M$.*

3.4. **Stability Results.** [Proof of Theorem 1.5] Again, it suffices to prove the theorem for death times and the proof for birth times is quite identical. Secondly, due to Theorem 3.23, we shall prove the stability result for weights of a minimal spanning acycle. We shall also assume $0 \leq p < \infty$ and the extension to $p = \infty$ follows by a standard limiting argument.

Let M, M' be the two minimal spanning acycles corresponding to f, f'. We begin with the following case: where f, f' differ precisely on one simplex σ and $f(\sigma) = a, f'(\sigma) = a', |a-a'| = c$. In this case, we shall show that $|M \triangle M'| \leq 2$, where $\triangle$ denotes the symmetric difference between the two sets. Since M, M' have equal cardinalities, $|M \triangle M'| \in \{0, 2\}$. If $M \triangle M' = \emptyset$, we are done since the identity map between the simplices in M, M' gives that

$$\inf_{\pi} \sum_{\sigma \in M} |f(\sigma) - f'(\pi(\sigma))|^p \leq c^p = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d} |f(\sigma) - f'(\sigma)|^p.$$

In the other case, $M \triangle M' = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$ with $\sigma_1 \in M, \sigma_2 \in M'$ and one of the σ_i's is σ. Further, we shall also show that $|f(\sigma_1) - f'(\sigma_2)| \leq c$. This again shows that

$$\inf_{\pi} \sum_{\sigma \in M} |w(\sigma) - w(\pi(\sigma))|^p \leq c^p = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d} |f(\sigma) - f'(\sigma)|^p.$$

By a recursive application of the above case, we can prove the theorem for the general case of f, f' differing in many simplices.

Thus we shall now on, focus only on the case of f, f' differing only at $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d$. Without loss of generality, assume that f, f' assign distinct weights to distinct faces and the case of non-distinct weights can be proved by appealing again to Remarks 2.6 and 3.12. Given a set $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, we shall use $M(I) = \{\sigma \in M : w(\sigma) \in I\}$ and similarly for M'. Also as before, $M(a) = M((-\infty, a]), M(a-) = M((-\infty, a))$. We shall break the proof into four cases where the first two take care of the trivial cases when $M \triangle M' = \emptyset$. We shall assume that both M, M' are generated by simplicial Kruskal's algorithm (Algorithm 2).

Case 1: Suppose $\sigma \in M$ and $a > a'$, i.e., $f(\sigma) > f'(\sigma)$. In this case, since $M(a), M'(a)$ are both maximal acycles in $K(a)$ we have that $|M(a)| = |M'(a)|$ and further by Kruskal's algorithm, $M(a'-) = M'(a'-)$. By Lemma 3.2, $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M'(a'-) \cup \sigma$ is acyclic and hence

$\sigma \in M'$. Further, since $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M(a-) \cup \sigma$ is acyclic, $M((a', a)) \subset M'$ and hence $M(a) = M'(a)$ since $M(a), M'(a)$ have equal cardinalities. So, by Kruskal's algorithm $M = M'$.
Case 2: Suppose $\sigma \notin M$ and $a' > a$. In this case, $M(a'-) = M'(a'-)$ and further $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M'(a'-) \cup \sigma$ is cyclic by Lemma 3.4 and so again by Kruskal's algorithm $M = M'$.
Case 3: Suppose $\sigma \in M$ and $a < a'$. If $\sigma \in M'$, then arguing as in Case 1, we have that $M = M'$. So let $\sigma \notin M'$. We shall show that $M'((a, a')) \setminus M((a, a')) = \{\tau\}$ and further that $M \triangle M' = \{\sigma, \tau\}$. Also, we have that $f'(\tau) - f(\sigma) \leq a' - a = c$ as needed.

To show the same, note that by Kruskal's algorithm $M(a-) = M'(a-)$ and $|M(a')| = |M'(a')|$. So, if we show that $M(a, a') \subset M'(a, a')$ then because of the equality of cardinalities, there exists a τ with $w(\tau) \in (a, a')$ such that $M'(a') = M(a) \cup M((a, a')) \cup \tau$.

We shall prove $M((a, a')) \subset M'((a, a'))$ by contradiction. Let $M((a, a')) = \{\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_k\}$ and τ_i be the first simplex (in increasing order of weights) such that $\tau_i \notin M'$. This means that some other simplex $\tau \notin M(a, a')$ that should have been added in M' before τ_i that creates a cycle along with τ_i and also a cycle with σ. More formally, there exists a $\tau \notin M$ with $a < f(\tau) < f(\tau_i)$ such that $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M(a-) \cup M((a, f(\tau))) \cup \tau$ is acyclic but $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M(a-) \cup M((a, f(\tau))) \cup \tau \cup \tau_i$ and $\mathcal{K}^{d-1} \cup M(a-) \cup M((a, f(\tau))) \cup \sigma \cup \tau$ are cyclic. These three statements together imply that there exist b, b' non-zero such that

$$\partial\tau - b\partial\sigma \in \partial(C_d(M(f(\tau)-)) - \sigma) \ ; \ \partial\tau_i - b'\partial\tau \in \partial(C_d(M(f(\tau)-)) - \sigma).$$

The above two statements imply that $\partial\tau_i - bb'\partial\sigma \in \partial(C_d(M(f(\tau)-)) - \sigma)$, a contradiction to the acyclicity of M. Hence $\tau_i \in M'$, $\forall i = 1, \ldots, k$ and so $M((a, a')) \subset M'((a, a'))$ as required. Thus, $M(a') \triangle M'(a') = \{\sigma, \tau\}$.

Now we need to show that $M(a', \infty) = M'(a', \infty)$ to conclude that $M \triangle M' = \{\sigma, \tau\}$. Since $M(a') \setminus M'(a') = \{\sigma\}$ and by Kruskal's algorithm σ is positive with respect to $M'(a') = M(a-) \cup M(a, a') \cup \tau$, we have that $\partial\sigma \in \partial(C_d(M'(a')))$. So, $\partial(C_d(M(a'))) = \partial(C_d(M'(a')))$ and hence by (2.5) and (2.6), negativity and positivity of simplices in Kruskal's algorithm remain unchanged after a' whether we are considering M or M'.
Case 4: Suppose $\sigma \notin M$ and $a' < a$. Then either $\sigma \notin M'$ or $\sigma \in M'$. If $\sigma \notin M'$, then $M = M'$ as in Case 2. If $\sigma \in M'$, arguing as in Case 3, we have that $M((a', a)) \setminus M'((a', a)) = \{\tau\}, M(a, \infty) = M'(a, \infty)$ and hence $M \triangle M' = \{\sigma, \tau\}$ with $f(\tau) - f'(\sigma) \leq a - a' = c$. □

4. Random $d-$ complex : I.I.D. uniform weights

We shall now consider randomly weighted complexes on n vertices. We consider first the simplest model where the weights are i.i.d. uniform on all possible d-faces and 0 elsewhere. We prove one of our main theorems - Theorem 1.3 - and the analogous result for weights of a minimal spanning acycle.

Definition 4.1. *Let $d \geq 1$ be some integer. Consider n vertices and let $\mathcal{K}_n^d$ be the complete $d-$skeleton on them. Let $w : \mathcal{K}_n^d \to [0, 1]$ be the weight function with the following properties:*

(1) *$w(\sigma) = 0$ for $\sigma \in \bigcup_{i=0}^{d-1} \mathcal{F}^i(\mathcal{K}_n^d)$, and*
(2) *$\{w(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K}_n^d)\}$ are i.i.d. uniform random variables on $[0, 1]$.*

The uniformly weighted $d-$complex $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}$ *is the simplicial complex* $\mathcal{K}_n^d$ *weighted by* w. *The canonical filtration associated with* $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}$ *is denoted using* $\{\mathcal{U}_{n,d}(t) : t \in [0,1]\}$. *That is,* $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}(t) := \{\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_n^d : w(\sigma) \leq t\}$.

Note that $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}(0)$ is almost surely (a.s.) the complete $(d-1)-$dimensional skeleton on n vertices. Further, note that the weights on the d-faces are a.s. distinct. The well-known random d-complex $Y_{n,d}(t)$, introduced in [45, 51] and defined before Lemma 1.2 is the same as $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}(t)$ in distribution. For ease of use, we shall write $\sigma \in \mathcal{U}_{n,d}$ to mean $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_n^d$. Similarly, $\mathcal{F}^i(\mathcal{U}_{n,d})$ shall mean $\mathcal{F}^i(\mathcal{K}_n^d)$ and so on.

Fix $d \geq 1$. Viewing $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}$ both as a randomly weighted simplicial complex and a filtration of random complexes, we are interested in the distributions of the following three point sets.

(1) Nearest neighbour distances of the $(d-1)-$faces, i.e., $\{C(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d})\}$. Here, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d})$,

$$C(\sigma) = \min_{\tau \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{U}_{n,d}), \tau \supset \sigma} w(\tau). \tag{4.1}$$

(2) Death times $\{D_i\}$ in the persistence diagram of $\mathbb{H}_{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d})$ (see Definition 2.3).
(3) Weights in the $d-$minimal spanning acycle M of $\mathcal{U}_{n,d} - \{w(\sigma) : \sigma \in M\}$ (see (2.10)).

Our key result here is that all the above three point sets, under appropriate scaling converge to a Poisson point process as the number of vertices go to infinity. We use factorial moment method to show convergence of the first point process and then show that this is a good enough approximation for the second point process. This yields convergence of the second point process and Theorem 3.23 easily gives the convergence of the third point process.

4.1. **Extremal nearest neighbour distances.** Fix $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d})$. Then $C(\sigma)$ as defined in (4.1) denotes the nearest neighbour distance of σ. By considering the filtration $\{\mathcal{U}_{n,d}(t) : t \in [0,1]\}$, note that σ is isolated (not part of any $d-$face) exactly between times 0 and $C(\sigma)$ in $\{\mathcal{U}_{n,d}(t) : t \in [0,1]\}$. The first coface of σ appears at $t = C(\sigma)$.

For each $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d})$, let $\bar{C}(\sigma) := nC(\sigma) - d\log n + \log(d!)$ and the scaled point set is

$$\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^C := \{\bar{C}(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d})\} \tag{4.2}$$

Viewing the latter as a point process for any $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^C(R) := |\{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d}) : \bar{C}(\sigma) \in R\}|. \tag{4.3}$$

For any $c \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^C(c,\infty) \equiv \mathscr{P}_{n,d}^C((c,\infty))$. Let $N_{n,d-1}(p)$ denote the number of isolated $(d-1)-$faces in $Y_{n,d}(p)$. Since $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}(p)$ has the same distribution as $Y_{n,d}(p)$, it follows that $\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^C(np - d\log n + \log(d!), \infty)$ has the same distribution as $N_{n,d-1}(p)$. From Lemma 1.2 we know that, as $n \to \infty$, $N_{n,d-1}(p_n)$ converges to $\mathrm{Poi}(e^{-c})$ (for some fixed $c \in \mathbb{R}$), the Poisson random variable with mean e^{-c}, whenever

$$p_n = \frac{d\log n + c - \log(d!)}{n}. \tag{4.4}$$

From this, we have $\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^C(c,\infty) \Rightarrow \mathrm{Poi}(e^{-c})$ as $n \to \infty$. We now extend this to a multivariate convergence, thereby proving convergence of point processes $\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^C$.

Theorem 4.2. *As $n \to \infty$ with p_n as in (4.4), $\mathscr{P}^C_{n,d}$ converges in distribution to the Poisson point process $\mathscr{P}_{poi}$, where $\mathscr{P}_{poi}$ is as in Theorem 1.3.*

Proof. Let $I := \cup_{j=1}^{m}(a_{2j-1}, a_{2j}] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary but fixed finite disjoint union of intervals. Since $\mathscr{P}_{\text{poi}}$ is simple and does not contain atoms, as per Lemma A.1, it suffices to establish the following two statements to prove weak convergence of the point process $\mathscr{P}^C_{n,d}$:

$$(i)\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathscr{P}^C_{n,d}(I)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathscr{P}_{\text{poi}}(I)] \text{ and } (ii)\ \mathscr{P}^C_{n,d}(I) \overset{d}{\Rightarrow} \mathscr{P}_{\text{poi}}(I) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Further, by the method of factorial moments, both the above statements hold if for all $l \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathscr{P}^C_{n,d}(I))^{(l)}] \to \left(\int_I e^{-x}dx\right)^{\ell} = \mathbb{E}[(\mathscr{P}_{\text{poi}}(I))^{(l)}], \tag{4.5}$$

where for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m^{(l)} = m(m-1)\dots(m-l+1)$ denotes its $l-$th factorial moment. Rest of the proof concerns proving (4.5).

Let $\ell \geq 1$ be fixed. Denote $\ell-$th factorial moment of $\mathscr{P}^C_{n,d}(I)$ by $M^{(\ell)}_{n,d}$. For $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d})$ and $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, define the indicator $1(\sigma; R) = \mathbf{1}[\bar{C}(\sigma) \in R]$. Then clearly

$$\mathscr{P}^C_{n,d}(I) = \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d})} 1(\sigma; I).$$

From this, it is not difficult to see that

$$M^{(\ell)}_{n,d} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathscr{I}^{(\ell)}_{n,d}} \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} 1(\sigma_i; I)\right],$$

where

$$\mathscr{I}^{(\ell)}_{n,d} := \{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \equiv (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_\ell) : \sigma_i \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d}) \text{ and no two of } \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_\ell \text{ are same}\}.$$

To simplify the computation of $M^{(\ell)}_{n,d}$, we group the faces $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathscr{I}^{(\ell)}_{n,d}$ which give the same value for $\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} 1(\sigma_i; I)\right]$. We do this as follows. For $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathscr{I}^{(\ell)}_{n,d}$, let

$$\gamma(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \equiv (|\cap_{i\in S}\sigma_i| : S \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\}, |S| \geq 2)$$

denote its intersection type. For $\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma'} \in \mathscr{I}^{(\ell)}_{n,d}$, we will say that both have similar intersection type, denoted by $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \sim \boldsymbol{\sigma'}$, if there exists a permutation π of the faces in $\boldsymbol{\sigma'}$ such that $\gamma(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \gamma(\pi(\boldsymbol{\sigma'}))$. It is easy to see that $\sim$ is an equivalence relation. Let $\Gamma := \{[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]\}$ denote the quotient of $\mathscr{I}^{(\ell)}_{n,d}$ under $\sim$ with $[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]$ denoting the equivalence class of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. Since the number of ways in which ℓ distinct $(d-1)-$faces can intersect each other is finite, we have that the number of equivalence classes in Γ, i.e., $|\Gamma|$, is upper bounded by some constant (w.r.t. n). Indeed $|\Gamma|$ depends on d and ℓ, but these are fixed a priori in our setup. Lastly, note that for $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathscr{I}^{(\ell)}_{n,d}$, the cardinality of its equivalence class $|[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]|$ indeed depends on n.

Fix $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \equiv (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_\ell)$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma'} \equiv (\sigma'_1, \dots, \sigma'_\ell)$ in $\mathscr{I}^{(\ell)}_{n,d}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \sim \boldsymbol{\sigma'}$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} 1(\sigma_i; I)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} 1(\sigma'_i; I)\right].$$

Hence $M_{n,d}^{(\ell)}$ can be rewritten as

$$M_{n,d}^{(\ell)} = \sum_{[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]\in\Gamma} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}'\in\mathscr{I}_{n,d}^{(\ell)}:\boldsymbol{\sigma}'\sim\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} 1(\sigma_i'; I)\right] = \sum_{[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]\in\Gamma} |[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]|\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} 1(\sigma_i; I)\right].$$

Counting the number of ways of choosing ℓ distinct $(d-1)-$faces from a total of $\binom{n}{d}$, we have $|\mathscr{I}_{n,d}^{(\ell)}| = \ell!\binom{\binom{n}{d}}{\ell}$. Since, for each $[\boldsymbol{\sigma}] \in \Gamma$, $[\boldsymbol{\sigma}] \subset \mathscr{I}_{n,d}^{(\ell)}$, we write $|[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]| = c_n([\boldsymbol{\sigma}])|\mathscr{I}_{n,d}^{(\ell)}|$, for some $c_n([\boldsymbol{\sigma}]) \in [0,1]$. Clearly

$$\sum_{[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]\in\Gamma} c_n([\boldsymbol{\sigma}]) = 1. \tag{4.6}$$

Hence it follows that

$$M_{n,d}^{(\ell)} = \sum_{[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]\in\Gamma} c_n([\boldsymbol{\sigma}])\ell!\binom{\binom{n}{d}}{\ell}\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} 1(\sigma_i; I)\right].$$

Since for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d})$,

$$1(\sigma; I) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} 1(\sigma; (a_{2j-1}, a_{2j}]) = \sum_{j=1}^{m}(1(\sigma; (a_{2j-1}, \infty)) - 1(\sigma; (a_{2j}, \infty))),$$

it follows that for any $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \equiv (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_\ell) \in \mathscr{I}_{n,d}^{(\ell)}$,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} 1(\sigma_i; I) = \sum_{(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_\ell)\in\{1,\ldots,2m\}^\ell} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell}(-1)^{\alpha_i+1}1(\sigma_i; (a_{\alpha_i}, \infty)),$$

where, for any $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, R^ℓ denotes the cartesian product of R taken ℓ times. Hence,

$$M_{n,d}^{(\ell)} = \sum_{[\boldsymbol{\sigma}]\in\Gamma} c_n([\boldsymbol{\sigma}]) \sum_{(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_\ell)\in\{1,\ldots,2m\}^\ell} \ell!\binom{\binom{n}{d}}{\ell}(-1)^{\sum_i \alpha_i + l}\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} 1(\sigma_i; (a_{\alpha_i}, \infty))\right]. \tag{4.7}$$

By the scaling of $C(\sigma)$, note that, for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d})$ and any $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$1(\sigma, (a, \infty)) = \mathbf{1}[C(\sigma) > \frac{a + d\log n - \log(d!)}{n}]$$

Combining this with (4.1) and (2) from Definition 4.1, observe that

$$\ell!\binom{\binom{n}{d}}{\ell}\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} 1(\sigma_i; (a_{\alpha_i}, \infty))\right] \sim \frac{n^{d\ell}}{(d!)^\ell}\prod_{i=1}^{\ell}\left(1 - \frac{a_{\alpha_i} + d\log n - \log(d!)}{n}\right)^{n-\kappa_i}.$$

Here $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_\ell \geq 0$ are some constants depending on how many vertices are common between the faces $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_\ell$. From this, irrespective of $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_\ell$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \ell!\binom{\binom{n}{d}}{\ell}\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} 1(\sigma_i; (a_{\alpha_i}, \infty))\right] = e^{-\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} a_{\alpha_i}}.$$

Substituting this in (4.7) and using (4.6), we derive (4.5) as follows :

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} M_{n,d}^{(\ell)} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m}[e^{-a_j} - e^{-b_j}]\right)^{\ell} = \left(\int_I e^{-x}dx\right)^{\ell}. \qquad \square$$

4.2. **Extremal death times.** We now discuss death times in the persistence diagram. First, we need the following lemma, which explains why nearest neighbour distances approximate death times in a persistence diagram.

Lemma 4.3. *Fix $d \geq 1$. Let $N_{d-1}(Y_{n,d}(p_n))$ be the number of isolated $(d-1)-$faces in $Y_{n,d}(p_n)$ with p_n as in (4.4). Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}|\beta_{d-1}(Y_{n,d}(p_n)) - N_{d-1}(Y_{n,d}(p_n))| = 0.$$

This lemma essentially follows from ideas in the proofs in [41, Theorem 1.10]. But, to the best of our knowledge, it has not been explicitly mentioned anywhere. The proof for the case $d \geq 2$ requires cohomological arguments and hence the entire proof along with more details on cohomology theory has been provided in an earlier version of the paper [59, Appendix C]

Recall from the discussion below (4.1) that $\{D_i\}$ denotes the set of all death times. Scale each death time $D_i \to nD_i - d\log n + \log(d!) =: \bar{D}_i$ and let

$$\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{D} = \{\bar{D}_i\} \tag{4.8}$$

denote the set of scaled death times related to $\mathbb{H}_{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d})$. For p_n as defined in (4.4), observe that for a c fixed and n large enough we have

$$\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{D}(c,\infty) = \beta_{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d}(p_n)) \ , \ \mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{C}(c,\infty) = N_{d-1}(\mathcal{U}_{n,d}(p_n)).$$

The above observation along with Lemma 4.3 yields the following easy corollary.

Corollary 4.4. *Let $c \in \mathbb{R}$ be arbitrary but fixed. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}|\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{D}(c,\infty) - \mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{C}(c,\infty)| = 0.$$

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem of the section.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let $I := \cup_{j=1}^{m}(a_{2j-1}, a_{2j}] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be some finite union of disjoint intervals. Since $\mathscr{P}_{\text{poi}}$ is simple and does not contain atoms, again as per Lemma A.1, to prove the desired result, it suffices to show that:

$$(i)\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{D}(I)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathscr{P}_{\text{poi}}(I)] \ \text{ and } \ (ii)\ \mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{D}(I) \stackrel{d}{\Rightarrow} \mathscr{P}_{\text{poi}}(I) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

From triangle inequality,

$$|\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{D}(I) - \mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{C}(I)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{2m} |\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{D}(a_j,\infty) - \mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{C}(a_j,\infty)|. \tag{4.9}$$

Combining this with Corollary 4.4 and the factorial moment convergence in (4.5), we get (i).

Arguing as above, we also have $|\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{D}(I) - \mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{C}(I)| \to 0$ in probability as $n \to \infty$. Combining this with Slutsky's theorem [28, Chapter 3, Corollary 3.3] and the distributional convergence of $\mathscr{P}_{n,d}^{C}(I)$ proven in Theorem 4.2, we obtain (ii) as desired. $\square$

4.3. **Extremal weights in the $d-$minimal spanning acycle.** Again fix $d \geq 1$. Viewing $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}$ as a weighted simplicial complex, let M denote its $d-$minimal spanning acycle. And let

$$\mathscr{P}^M_{n,d} := \{nw(\sigma) - d\log n + \log(d!) : \sigma \in M\} \tag{4.10}$$

denote the set of scaled weights of the faces in the $d-$minimal spanning acycle of $\mathcal{U}_{n,d}$. Using Theorems 3.23 and 1.3, we get the following theorem immediately.

Theorem 4.5. *As $n \to \infty$, $\mathscr{P}^M_{n,d}$ converges in distribution to the Poisson point process $\mathscr{P}_{poi}$, where $\mathscr{P}_{poi}$ is as in Theorem 1.3.*

Recall from Corollary 3.16 and Theorem 3.23, we have that $\mathscr{P}^C_{n,d} \subset \mathscr{P}^D_{n,d} = \mathscr{P}^M_{n,d}$. But as we have shown, the extremal points of the three point sets coincide asymptotically.

5. Random $d-$ complexes : I.I.D. Generic Weights with Perturbation

Here, in contrast to the previous section, we deal with simplicial complexes whose $d-$face weights are perturbations of some generic i.i.d. distribution. Our key result here is that if the perturbations decay sufficiently fast, then the point process convergence results from the previous section continue to hold. The proof is a transparent consequence of our stability result (Theorem 1.5). We first define our model.

Definition 5.1. *Let $d \geq 1$ be some integer. Consider n vertices and let $\mathcal{K}^d_n$ be the complete $d-$skeleton on them. Let $\phi' : \mathcal{K}^d_n \to [0,1]$ be the weight function with the following properties:*

1. *$\phi'(\sigma) = 0$ for $\sigma \in \bigcup_{i=0}^{d-1} \mathcal{F}^i(\mathcal{K}^d_n)$, and*
2. *$\phi'(\sigma) = \phi(\sigma) + \epsilon_n(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K}^d_n)$, where $\{\phi(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K}^d_n)\}$ are real valued i.i.d. random variables with some generic distribution $\mathscr{F} : R \subseteq \mathbb{R} \to [0,1]$ perturbed respectively by $\{\epsilon_n(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{K}^d_n)\}$, another set of real valued random variables (not necessarily independent or identically distributed).*

The generically weighted $d-$complex with perturbation $\mathcal{L}'_{n,d}$ *is the simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}^d_n$ weighted by ϕ'. Associated with $\mathcal{L}'_{n,d}$ is the canonical simplicial process given by the filtration $\{\mathcal{L}'_{n,d}(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, where $\mathcal{L}'_{n,d}(t) = \{\sigma \in \mathcal{K}^d_n : \phi'(\sigma) \leq t\}$.*

For ease of use, we shall write $\sigma \in \mathcal{L}'_{n,d}$ to mean $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}^d_n$. Similarly, $\mathcal{F}^i(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d})$ shall mean $\mathcal{F}^i(\mathcal{K}^d_n)$ and so on. Now consider the following three scaled point processes on $\mathbb{R}$.

1. $\mathscr{P}^{C'}_{n,d} := \{n\mathscr{F}(C'(\sigma)) - d\log n + \log(d!) : \sigma \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d})\}$, where, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{L}'_{n,d}$,
$$C'(\sigma) := \min_{\tau \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d}), \tau \supset \sigma} \phi'(\tau).$$
2. $\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d} := \{n\mathscr{F}(D'_i) - d\log n + \log(d!)\}$, where $\{D'_i\}$ denotes the set of death times in the persistence diagram of $\mathbb{H}_{d-1}(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d})$ (see Definition 2.3).
3. $\mathscr{P}^{M'}_{n,d} := \{n\mathscr{F}(\phi'(\sigma)) - d\log n + \log(d!) : \sigma \in M'\}$, where M' is a $d-$minimal spanning acycle in $\mathcal{L}'_{n,d}$ (see (2.10)).

One can look at the simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}^d_n$ weighted by ϕ alone, which we shall refer to as $\mathcal{L}_{n,d}$. With respect to this $\mathcal{L}_{n,d}$, define $C(\sigma)$, D_i, and M, and $\mathscr{P}^C_{n,d}$, $\mathscr{P}^D_{n,d}$, and $\mathscr{P}^M_{n,d}$, exactly as

above. Also, similarly define $\mathcal{F}^i(\mathcal{L}_{n,d})$ etc. In relation to the perturbation random variables, let

$$\|\epsilon_n\|_\infty := \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d})} |\epsilon_n(\sigma)| \ ; \ \|\epsilon_n\|_1 := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d})} |\epsilon_n(\sigma)|.$$

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose that $\mathscr{F}$ is continuous and strictly increasing. Then the point processes $\mathscr{P}^C_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^D_{n,d}$, and $\mathscr{P}^M_{n,d}$, converge in distribution to $\mathscr{P}_{poi}$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof. Clearly, $\{\mathscr{F}(\phi(\sigma))\}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{L}_{n,d})}$ are i.i.d. uniform $[0,1]$ random variables. The desired result is now immediate from Theorems 4.2, 1.3 and 4.5 □

We now state our main perturbation result (Theorem 5.3) and then describe Corollaries 5.5 and 5.6, which give simpler bounds to verify assumptions of this result. Note that we additionally need Lipschitz continuity of $\mathscr{F}$.

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose that $\mathscr{F}$ is Lipschitz continuous and strictly increasing. If $n\|\epsilon_n\|_\infty \to 0$ in probability, then each of $\mathscr{P}^{C'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}$, and $\mathscr{P}^{M'}_{n,d}$ converges in distribution to $\mathscr{P}_{poi}$.*

We need a lemma before we prove the above result. The first inequality is straightforward and the next two follow from Theorem 1.5 for $p = \infty$, and Theorem 3.23.

Lemma 5.4. *For fixed $n, d \geq 1$, we have the following inequalities:*

$$\max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^{d-1}(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d})} |C'(\sigma) - C(\sigma)| \leq \|\epsilon_n\|_\infty,$$

$$\inf_\gamma \max_i |D'_i - \gamma(D_i)| \leq ||\phi' - \phi||_\infty \leq \|\epsilon_n\|_\infty,$$

where the infimum is over all possible bijections $\gamma : \{D'_i\} \to \{D_i\}$, and

$$\inf_\gamma \max_i |\phi'(\sigma'_i) - \gamma(\phi(\sigma_i))| \leq ||\phi' - \phi||_\infty \leq \|\epsilon_n\|_\infty,$$

where the infimum is over all possible bijections $\gamma : \{\phi'(\sigma') : \sigma' \in M'\} \to \{\phi(\sigma) : \sigma \in M\}$.

Proof of Theorem 5.3. We only show that $\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d} \Rightarrow \mathscr{P}_{\text{poi}}$ as $n \to \infty$ using Lemma 5.4, as the other results follow similarly. Let d_v be the vague metric given in (A.1). Suppose we show that $d_v(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^D_{n,d}) \to 0$ in probability as $n \to \infty$. Then using Slutsky's theorem ([28, Chapter 3, Corollary 3.3]), Theorem 5.2, and Lemma A.1, it follows that $\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d} \Rightarrow \mathscr{P}_{\text{poi}}$ as desired. It thus suffices to prove that $d_v(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^D_{n,d}) \to 0$ in probability as $n \to \infty$.

Let d_B be as in Definition 2.9. Then by Lemma 5.4, we have that

$$d_B(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^D_{n,d}) \leq \zeta n \|\epsilon_n\|_\infty.$$

where we have assumed that the Lipschitz constant is ζ. Now by assumption, $d_B(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}) \to 0$ in probability. Fix $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and choose $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{k} \in (0,1)$ for some $k \geq 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\{d_v(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}) > \epsilon\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\{d_v(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}) > \epsilon, d_B(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}) \leq \delta\} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}\{d_v(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}) > \epsilon, d_B(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}) > \delta\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\{2\lambda \mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}(K_\epsilon)\delta > \epsilon/2\} + \mathbb{P}\{d_B(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}) > \delta\}, \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}(K_\epsilon) > \frac{k}{4\lambda}\right\} + \mathbb{P}\{d_B(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}) > \delta\}. \qquad (5.1)
\end{aligned}$$

For the second inequality, we have used (A.2) with λ and the compact set K_ϵ as given there. Since the second term in (5.1) converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$, using Theorem 5.2, we have that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\{d_V(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}) > \epsilon\} \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{\mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}(K_\epsilon) > \frac{k}{4\lambda}\right\} = \mathbb{P}\left\{\mathscr{P}_{\text{poi}}(K_\epsilon) > \frac{k}{4\lambda}\right\}.$$

Now letting $k \to \infty$, we have that $d_V(\mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D}_{n,d}) \to 0$ in probability as desired. □

Except for a few trivial cases, for dependent random variables $\{\epsilon_n(\sigma)\}$ (even if they are identically distributed), determining the distribution of the maximum $\|\epsilon_n\|_\infty$ is not easy and hence might restrict application of Theorem 5.1. The next two corollaries require simple expectation bounds to verify the assumptions of Theorem 5.3 for the case of dependent $\epsilon_n(\sigma)$'s and for ease of stating the results, we consider only identically distributed weights.

Corollary 5.5. *For each n, let $\{\psi(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d})\}$ have the same distribution as the real valued random variable ψ which, for some $s > 0$, satisfies $\mathbb{E}[e^{s|\psi|}] < \infty$. Define $\epsilon_n(\sigma) = a_n^{-1}\psi(\sigma)$ where a_n is a sequence such that $a_n = \omega(n \log n)$[7]. If $\mathscr{F}$ is Lipschitz continuous and strictly increasing, then, each of $\mathscr{P}^{C'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}$, and $\mathscr{P}^{M'}_{n,d}$ converges in distribution to $\mathscr{P}_{poi}$.*

Proof. Using Jensen's inequality for the second inequality below and since $|\mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d})| \leq n^{d+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
s\mathbb{E}[\|\epsilon_n\|_\infty] &\leq \frac{1}{a_n} \log e^{s\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{\sigma\in\mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d})} |\psi(\sigma)|\right]} \leq \frac{1}{a_n} \log \mathbb{E}\left[e^{s \max_{\sigma\in\mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d})} |\psi(\sigma)|}\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{a_n} \log \mathbb{E}\left[\max_{\sigma\in\mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d})} e^{s|\psi(\sigma)|}\right] \leq \frac{1}{a_n} \log(n^{d+1}\mathbb{E}[e^{s|\psi|}]).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $n||\epsilon_n||_\infty \to 0$ in probability as $n \to \infty$. The result now follows from Theorem 5.3. □

Corollary 5.6. *For each n, let $\{\epsilon_n(\sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d(\mathcal{L}'_{n,d})\}$ be identically distributed random variables with $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_n(\sigma)] = o(n^{-d-2})$ for each σ. If $\mathscr{F}$ is Lipschitz continuous and strictly increasing, then, each of $\mathscr{P}^{C'}_{n,d}, \mathscr{P}^{D'}_{n,d}$, and $\mathscr{P}^{M'}_{n,d}$ converges in distribution to $\mathscr{P}_{poi}$.*

Proof. Using Markov's inequality and $\|\epsilon_n\|_\infty \leq \|\epsilon_n\|_1$, the result follows from Theorem 5.3. □

[7]Here w is the small omega notation.

5.1. **Limits for Expected Lifetime Sums :** Reconsider the perturbed random complex $\mathcal{L}'_{n,d}$ as in Definition 5.1. For simplicity, assume that the generic distribution $\mathcal{F}$ is uniform $[0,1]$ distribution, i.e., the weights $\phi(\sigma)$ are i.i.d. uniform $[0,1]$ random variables. Recall that $\{\mathcal{L}'_{n,d}(t) : t \in [0,1]\}$ yields a canonical filtration of the simplicial complex. Further, let $L_{n,d}, L'_{n,d}$ denote the lifetime sums (see (1.1)) respectively in the two models $\mathcal{L}_{n,d}$ and $\mathcal{L}'_{n,d}$. Then by our stability result (Theorem 1.5), we have

$$|L_{n,d} - L'_{n,d}| \leq 2 \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d} |\epsilon_n(\sigma)| = 2\|\epsilon_n\|_1.$$

Now combining this observation with [29] and [33, Theorem 1.2] (see (1.4)) and further assuming that $\sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}^d} \mathbb{E}[|\epsilon_n(\sigma)|] = o(n^{-2})$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[L'_{n,1}] \to \zeta(3), \;\; \mathbb{E}[L'_{n,d}] = \Theta(n^{d-1}), \text{ for } d \geq 2,$$

where ζ is Riemann's zeta function. We have thus extended the lifetime sum results for uniformly weighted $d-$complexes to noisy/perturbed versions of the same.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported through the program "Research in Pairs" by the Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach in 2015.

Appendix A. Convergence of Point processes

We discuss here convergence of point processes under vague topology. For notations and definitions, see Subsection 2.1. Firstly, it is known that $(M_p(\mathbb{R}), \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R}))$ is metrizable as a complete, separable metric space ([58, Chapter 3, Proposition 3.17]). In the proof of this proposition, the vague metric d_v has been defined which we describe next.

Let $\{G_i\}$ be the collection of open intervals in $\mathbb{R}$ with rational end points and let $\{h_j\}$ be suitable piece-wise linear approximations to the indicator function of these sets. The functions h_j are chosen so that they lie in $C_c^+(\mathbb{R})$ and are Lipschitz continuous (while it is not explicitly highlighted, from the definition of h_j in the proof of [58, Chapter 3, Proposition 3.17], one can check that it is Lipschitz). Then for $m_1, m_2 \in M_p(\mathbb{R})$,

$$d_v(m_1, m_2) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - \exp\{-|m_1(h_j) - m_2(h_j)|\}}{2^j} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\min\{|m_1(h_j) - m_2(h_j)|, 1\}}{2^j}. \tag{A.1}$$

Since probability measures on Polish spaces (i.e., complete, separable metric spaces) are more tractable, it is of importance to us that $M_p(\mathbb{R})$ is a Polish space. The following is an oft-used result to prove weak convergence to a simple point process on $\mathbb{R}$.

Lemma A.1. [58, Proposition 3.22] *Let $\{\mathscr{P}_n\}, \mathscr{P}$ be point processes on $\mathbb{R}$ with $\mathscr{P}$ being simple. Let $\mathcal{I}(\mathbb{R})$ be the collection of all finite union of intervals in $\mathbb{R}$. Suppose that for each $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{R})$, with $\mathbb{P}\{\mathscr{P}(\partial I) = 0\} = 1$, we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\{\mathscr{P}_n(I) = 0\} = \mathbb{P}\{\mathscr{P}(I) = 0\} \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathscr{P}_n(I)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathscr{P}(I)] < \infty.$$

Then $\mathscr{P}_n \Rightarrow \mathscr{P}$ in $M_p(\mathbb{R})$.

We now prove a lemma that will be useful when combining results from computational topology (which uses bottleneck distance) and point process theory (vague topology).

Lemma A.2. *The topology of bottleneck distance on $M_p(\mathbb{R})$ is stronger than that of vague topology on $M_p(\mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. The desired result follows if we show that for all $m \in M_p(\mathbb{R})$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ (depending on m, ϵ) such that $d_B(m_1, m) \leq \delta$ implies that $d_v(m_1, m) < \epsilon$.

Set $\delta = d_B(m_1, m)$ and, without loss of generality, assume that $\delta < 1$. Further let $\gamma : supp(m) \to supp(m_1)$ be the bijection such that $\max_{x \in \text{supp}(m)} |x - \gamma(x)| \leq \delta$. Now, the following is enough to prove the above claim: For a given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists constant λ and a compact set K_ϵ (depending on ϵ alone) such that the following bound holds:

$$d_v(m_1, m) \leq 2\lambda m(K_\epsilon)\delta + \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \tag{A.2}$$

To prove the above bound, first note that for a given $\epsilon > 0$, from (A.1) we can choose k such that the following holds:

$$d_v(m_1, m) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} |m_1(h_j) - m(h_j)| + \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Let us set K_j to be the compact support of h_j and λ_j to be the Lipschitz constant. By the definition of Bottleneck distance, we have that for any compact set K

$$m_1(K) \leq m(K^\delta) \leq m_1(K^{2\delta}), \tag{A.3}$$

where $K^\delta := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \exists y \in K \text{ s.t. } |x - y| \leq \delta\}$. Fix a $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and set $M = supp(m), M_1 = supp(m_1)$. Now by definition of $m(h_j)$ and that h_j is a λ_j-Lipschitz continuous function supported on K_j, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |m_1(h_j) - m(h_j)| &= |\sum_{x \in M} h_j(x) - \sum_{x \in M_1} h_j(x)| = |\sum_{x \in M} [h_j(x) - h_j(\gamma(x))]| \\ &\leq \lambda_j [m(K_j) + m_1(K_j)]\delta \leq 2\lambda_j m(K_j^1)\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (A.3) and the fact that $\delta < 1$. Now setting $\lambda = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j$ and $K_\epsilon = \cup_{j=1}^{k} K_j^1$, we get the desired bound (A.2). □

References

1. David Aldous and J. Michael Steele, *Asymptotics for euclidean minimal spanning trees on random points*, Prob. Th. and Rel. Fields **92** (1992), no. 2, 247–258.
2. Kenneth S. Alexander, *Percolation and minimal spanning forests in infinite graphs*, Ann. Probab. **23** (1995), no. 1, 87–104.
3. M.J.B. Appel and R.P. Russo, *The connectivity of a graph on uniform points on* $[0, 1]^d$, Statistical Probability Letters **60** (2002), 351–357.
4. C. Bajo, B. Burdick, and S. Chmutov, *On the tutte–krushkal–renardy polynomial for cell complexes*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A **123** (2014), no. 1, 186 – 201.

5. C. A. N. Biscio and J. Møller, *The accumulated persistence function, a new useful functional summary statistic for topological data analysis, with a view to brain artery trees and spatial point process applications*, 2016, arXiv:1611.00630.
6. O. Bobrowski and M. Kahle, *Topology of random geometric complexes: A survey*, arXiv:1409.4734, 2014.
7. B. Bollobàs, *Random graphs*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 73, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
8. P. Bubenik, *Statistical topological data analysis using persistence landscapes*, Journal of Machine Learning Research **16** (2015), no. 1, 77–102.
9. G. Carlsson, *Topology and data*, Bulletin of the Ameriancan Mathematical Society **46** (2009), no. 2, 255–308.
10. _____, *Topological pattern recognition for point cloud data*, Acta Numerica **23** (2014), 289–368.
11. F. Chazal, D. Cohen-Steiner, M. Glisse, L. J. Guibas, and S. Y. Oudot, *Proximity of persistence modules and their diagrams*, Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual Symposium on Computational geometry, ACM, 2009, pp. 237–246.
12. F. Chazal, V. De Silva, and S. Y. Oudot, *Persistence stability for geometric complexes*, Geometriae Dedicata **173** (2014), no. 1, 193–214.
13. Frédéric Chazal, Vin De Silva, Marc Glisse, and Steve Oudot, *The structure and stability of persistence modules*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.3674 (2012).
14. D. Cohen, A. Costa, M. Farber, and T. Kappeler, *Topology of random 2-complexes*, Discrete and Computational Geometry **47** (2012), no. 1, 117–149.
15. D. Cohen-Steiner, H. Edelsbrunner, and J. Harer, *Stability of persistence diagrams*, Discrete and Computational Geometry **37** (2007), no. 1, 103–120.
16. D. Cohen-Steiner, H. Edelsbrunner, J. Harer, and Y. Mileyko, *Lipschitz functions have l p-stable persistence*, Foundations of computational mathematics **10** (2010), no. 2, 127–139.
17. T. H. Cormen, C.E. Leiserson, and R.L. Rivest, *Introduction to algorithms*, MIT Press and McGraw-Hill., 2009.
18. A. E. Costa and M. Farber, *The asphericity of random 2-dimensional complexes*, Random Structures and Algorithms **46** (2015), no. 2, 261–273.
19. _____, *Geometry and topology of random 2-complexes*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **209** (2015), no. 2, 883–927.
20. A.E. Costa, M. Farber, and T. Kappeler, *Topics of stochastic algebraic topology*, Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science **283** (2012), no. 0, 53 – 70, Proceedings of the workshop on Geometric and Topological Methods in Computer Science (GETCO).
21. William Crawley-Boevey, *Decomposition of pointwise finite-dimensional persistence modules*, Journal of Algebra and Its Applications **14** (2015), no. 05, 1550066.
22. C J A Delfinado and H Edelsbrunner, *An incremental algorithm for Betti numbers of simplicial complexes*, Proceedings of the ninth annual Symposium on Computational geometry, ACM, 1993, pp. 232–239.
23. E. W. Dijkstra, *A note on two problems in connexion with graphs*, Numerische Mathematik (1959), no. 1, 269—271.
24. A M. Duval, C J. Klivans, and J L. Martin, *Simplicial matrix-tree theorems*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **361** (2009), no. 11, 6073–6114.
25. H. Edelsbrunner and J.L. Harer, *Computational topology, an introduction*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010.
26. H. Edelsbrunner, D. Letscher, and A. Zomorodian, *Topological persistence and simplification*, Discrete and Computational Geometry **28** (2002), no. 4, 511–533.
27. P. Erdös and A. Rényi, *On random graphs, i*, Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen **6** (1959), 290–297.

28. S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz, *Markov processes: characterization and convergence*, vol. 282, John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
29. A. Frieze, *On the value of a random minimum spanning tree problem*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **10** (1985), no. 1, 47 – 56.
30. A. Frieze and M. Karoǹski, *Introduction to random graphs*, Cambridge University Press, 2016.
31. A. Hatcher, *Algebraic topology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 2002.
32. N. Henze, *The limit distribution for maxima of "weighted" rth-nearest-neighbour distances*, Journal of Applied Probability **19** (1982), no. 2, 344–354.
33. Y. Hiraoka and T. Shirai, *Minimum spanning acycle and lifetime of persistent homology in the Linial-Meshulam process*, 2015, arXiv:1503.05669.
34. Y. Hiraoka and T. Shirai, *Tutte polynomials and random-cluster models in bernoulli cell complexes*, 2016, arXiv:1602.04561.
35. T. Hsing and H. Rootzen, *Extremes on trees*, Annals of Probability **33** (2005), no. 1, 413–444.
36. M. E.H. Ismail, E. Koelink, V. Reiner, A. M. Duval, C. J. Klivans, and J. L. Martin, *Cellular spanning trees and laplacians of cubical complexes*, Advances in Applied Mathematics **46** (2011), no. 1, 247 – 274.
37. S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Rucinski, *Random graphs*, Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization, Wiley, New York, 2000.
38. V. Jarník, *O jistém problému minimálním, [about a certain minimal problem]*, Práce Moravské Přírodovědecké Společnosti (in Czech) (1930), no. 6, 57—63.
39. M. Kahle, *Topology of random simplicial complexes: a survey*, AMS Contemporary Mathematics **620** (2014), 201–222.
40. M. Kahle, *Random simplicial complexes*, 2016, arXiv:160707069.
41. M. Kahle and B. Pittel, *Inside the critical window for cohomology of random k-complexes*, Random Structures and Algorithms (2014).
42. G. Kalai, *Enumeration of $\mathbb{Q}$-acyclic simplicial complexes*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **45** (1983), no. 4, 337–351.
43. V. Krushkal and D. Renardy, *A polynomial invariant and duality for triangulations*, Electronic Journal of Combinatorics **21** (2014), no. 3.
44. J. B. Kruskal, *On the shortest spanning subtree of a graph and the traveling salesman problem*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society (1956), no. 7, 48—50.
45. N. Linial and R. Meshulam, *Homological connectivity of random 2-complexes*, Combinatorica **26** (2006), no. 4, 475–487.
46. N. Linial, I. Newman, Y. Peled, and Y. Rabinovich, *Extremal problems on shadows and hypercuts in simplicial complexes*, 2014.
47. N. Linial and Y. Peled, *On the phase transition in random simplicial complexes*, 2014.
48. R. Lyons, *Random complexes and ℓ^2-betti numbers*, Journal of Topology and Analysis **01** (2009), no. 02, 153–175.
49. R. Lyons and Y. Peres, *Probability on trees and networks*, Cambridge University Press, 2016, Available at `http://pages.iu.edu/~rdlyons/`.
50. R. Mathew, I. Newman, Y. Rabinovich, and D. Rajendraprasad, *Boundaries of Hypertrees and Hamiltonian Cycles in Simplicial Complexes*, 2015.
51. R Meshulam and N Wallach, *Homological connectivity of random k-dimensional complexes*, Random Structures and Algorithms **34** (2009), no. 3, 408–417.
52. J.R. Munkres, *Elements of algebraic topology*, Addison-Wesley, 1984.
53. J. Oxley, *What is a matroid?*, Cubo Matemática Educacional **5** (2003), no. 3, 179–218.
54. M. D Penrose, *The longest edge of the random minimal spanning tree*, Annals of Applied Probability (1997), 340–361.

55. M. D. Penrose, *Random geometric graphs*, Oxford Studies in Probability, vol. 5, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.
56. G. Petri, P. Expert, F. Turkheimer, R. Carhart-Harris, D. Nutt, P.J. Hellyer, and F. Vaccarino, *Homological scaffolds of brain functional networks*, Journal of The Royal Society Interface **11** (2014), no. 101.
57. R. C. Prim, *Shortest connection networks and some generalizations*, Bell System Technical Journal **36** (1957), no. 6, 1389—1401.
58. S. I. Resnick, *Extreme values, regular variation and point processes*, Springer, 2013.
59. P. Skraba, G. Thoppe, and D. Yogeshwaran, *Randomly Weighted $d-$complexes: Minimal Spanning Acycles and Persistence Diagrams*, 2017, arXiv:1701.00239v1.
60. Primoz Skraba and Mikael Vejdemo-Johansson, *Persistence modules: algebra and algorithms*, arXiv:1302.2015 (2013).
61. J. M. Steele and L. Tierney, *Boundary domination and the distribution of the largest nearest-neighbor link in higher dimensions*, Journal of Applied Probability **23** (1986), no. 2, 524–528.
62. V. E. Stepanov, *Combinatorial algebra and random graphs*, Theory of Probability and Its Applications **14** (1969), no. 3, 373–399.
63. E. Szpilrajn, *Sur l'extension de l'ordre partiel*, Fundamenta mathematicae **16** (1930), no. 1, 386–389.
64. Remco Van Der Hofstad, *Random graphs and complex networks*, 2016, Available at http://www.win.tue.nl/ rhofstad/NotesRGCN.html.
65. D. J. A. Welsh, *Matroid theory*, Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London-New York, 1976, L. M. S. Monographs, No. 8.
66. Wikipedia, *Minimum spanning tree — wikipedia, the free encyclopedia*, 2016, [Online; accessed 10-February-2016].
67. A. Zomorodian and G. Carlsson, *Computing persistent homology*, Discrete and Computational Geometry **33** (2005), no. 2, 249–274.

(PS) Jozef Stefan Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia & FAMNIT, University of Primorska, Koper, Slovenia
E-mail address: primoz.skraba@ijs.si

(GT) Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel
E-mail address: gthoppe@technion.ac.il

(DY) Statistics and Mathematics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Bengaluru, India
E-mail address: d.yogesh@isibang.ac.in